

Mr. BARKLEY. I cannot tell definitely.

Mr. WHITE. Some Members of the Senate, on this side of the aisle, at least, are anxious to know when the next executive session will be held.

Mr. BARKLEY. I cannot tell now, I am sorry to say.

I now move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 18, 1944, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate, April 17 (legislative day of April 12), 1944:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

J. Rives Childs, of Virginia, now a Foreign Service officer of class 3 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

Philip D. Sprouse, of Tennessee, now a Foreign Service officer of class 3 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO FINANCE DEPARTMENT

Lt. Col. Richard Evans Glasson Opie, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from December 11, 1942.

Second Lt. Frederick Charles Uhler, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from May 29, 1942.

TO CAVALRY

Lt. Col. Hobart Raymond Gay, Quartermaster Corps (temporary brigadier general), with rank from August 18, 1940.

TO INFANTRY

Maj. Murray Bradshaw Crandall, Cavalry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1941.

TO AIR CORPS

Second Lt. Bruce Wilds Postlethwaite Edgerton, Quartermaster Corps, with rank from June 11, 1941.

Second Lt. Robert Edward Harrington, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from January 19, 1943.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY

Capt. Gordon Rowe, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as commander fleet air, Quonset Point.

Capt. Malcolm F. Schoeffel, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 15th day of July 1943.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, APRIL 17, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most righteous Father, be pleased to accept our praise of Him who, in the surging breast of this life, hath given us the light by which our souls grow and aspire. He is our God forever and forever, and will be our guide even unto death. Therefore, let us not mourn our vanquished dreams with their poignant

losses, nor allow misfortune or difficulty to break down our spirits, but, rather, seek their solution in the strengthening of the soul. O, give us braver and warmer hearts.

Thou who dwellest in the heavens and earth, Thou who art a great God and greatly to be praised, grant that our wisdom and devotion may be exemplified in our moderation, desisting from self-praise and invidious comparisons. In our thoughts and actions, we pray for a basis of life that shall be credible and inspiring to the best interpretation of politics, education, and religion. Teach us to avoid lapses, needless diversions, and wasted time, and never be holden by the bounds of narrowness in word or deed. We pray for that devotion to our country and for that fidelity of righteous purpose which nothing can lessen or many waters drown. Based on noble principles, brightened by enduring patriotic hopes, crown us all with a sublime sense of duty, and Thine shall be the praise. In the name of Him whose God is the Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, April 14, 1944, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the Joint Select Committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of the Treasury.
3. Federal Security Agency.
4. Federal Works Agency.
5. War Production Board.

INTERNATIONAL LABOR CONFERENCE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand a letter from Hon. Frances Perkins, Secretary of Labor, addressed to the Speaker of the House, in relation to the coming International Labor Conference, which is to be held in Philadelphia on April 20. This letter extends an invitation to Members of Congress to be present, and states that those desiring to be present will be provided with appropriate cards of admission and detailed information as to the program as it is developed.

I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by including this letter, addressed to the Speaker from the Secretary of Labor, at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The letter referred to follows:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, April 15, 1944.

The Honorable SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I wish to extend to Members of the House of Representatives an invitation to attend the sessions of the In-

ternational Labor Conference, which will open at 11 o'clock in the morning, April 20, in Philadelphia, Mitten Hall, Temple University. At this meeting 300 delegates, representing 40 countries, will come together to discuss and vote on recommendations to the United Nations for present and post-war policy, and to outline plans for the maintenance of high employment levels after the war. Each national delegation will be composed not only of official Government delegates, but will also include representatives of employer and labor organizations from each country. Senator THOMAS of Utah and I have been appointed by the President as the two Government delegates of the United States. The names of the employer and labor delegates are about to be announced.

This will be the twenty-sixth annual conference of the International Labor Organization, of which the United States has been a member for 10 years. It is being held here at the official invitation of our Government. The conference in Philadelphia will offer an unparalleled opportunity for observing the proceedings of an international congress at first hand. This world assembly follows the same pattern as that of the United States Congress. In addition to plenary sessions, there will be a number of working committees and group caucuses. The importance of the topics on its program and the gravity of the present world situation should lend historical significance to the proceedings.

I sincerely hope that a number of Congressmen, despite their busy schedules, will be able to attend the conference sometime during the 3-week period of its sessions. If Congressmen will communicate with me, I shall be glad to see that they are provided with appropriate cards of admission and detailed information as to how the program will be developed.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCES PERKINS,

HOURS OF DUTY OF POSTAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 2928, to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the hours of duty of postal employees, and for other purposes," with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BURCH]? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Mr. BURCH of Virginia, Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan, Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee, Mr. HARTLEY, and Mr. MASON.

ELECTION TO STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a resolution, House Resolution 499, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That DEAN M. GILLESPIE, of Colorado, be, and he is hereby, elected to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds of the House of Representatives.

The resolution was agreed to.

MRS. MARY GLUSING ELLIOTT

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Accounts, I submit a privileged resolution, House Resolution 500, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House to Mrs. Mary Glusing Elliott, widow of William P. Elliott, late an employee of the House, an amount equal to 6 months' salary at the rate he was receiving at the time of his death, and an additional amount not to exceed \$250 toward defraying the funeral expenses of the said William P. Elliott.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by inserting in the RECORD a brief editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, after the conclusion of the business of the day and any other special orders, I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the business today and such other special orders as may have been entered I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a short editorial from the Washington Star entitled "It Needs Looking Into."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a short article from the Chicago Sun and an editorial from the Chicago Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter which I wrote to the New York Herald Tribune for the relief of the starving children of the German-occupied countries of Europe, which appeared in that paper on April 16, 1944.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Oil City Derrick.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

NAVAL OIL LEASES

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. GAVIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a recent radio address.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the New York Times in regard to American foreign policy.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include the keynote address delivered in Hartford, Conn., on April 13, by our distinguished minority leader the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on two separate subjects.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

GENERAL MACARTHUR

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, it was very unfortunate that one of our colleagues last week gave to the press letters that he had written to General MacArthur and letters that General MacArthur had written to him.

In my opinion, General MacArthur is a great soldier and a great organizer. I have known him for years and thought a great deal of him. It seems to me that I noticed in some paper that these letters were private. Will someone please inform me whether they were marked "confidential" or "private" or "not for publication"? I would like to know this.

Ah, sir! Here in the midst of a great war General MacArthur must realize as a commander in chief in the Pacific the seriousness of the publication of these

letters written to him by our colleague. It seems to me that I have heard something from the gentlemen on the minority about a smear political campaign. Everyone can realize from the letters sent from here that a smear campaign is being attempted, and I might say to the gentleman who sent these letters, who made the statement that the General could carry all the States, that this is at least a gross exaggeration, and others realize that this is one and realize then that there are other exaggerations in the letters.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Danville Register, Danville, Va.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address I made at the annual meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association in Chicago, Ill., on March 21, 1944.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my own remarks, and to include therein two resolutions.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a brief editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

REPUBLICAN CANDIDATES

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, if I may have the attention of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], the gentleman in the White House and the gentleman from Mississippi started Wendell Willkie on his campaign, one by sending him around the world, and the other by talking about him so often from the well of the House, and Willkie was making the most of it. Now, if you on the Democratic side will just keep your noses out of our Republican business we will get along all right, and we will put someone in the White House who will start this Nation on the way it should travel to win the war with the least possible loss of

life, on the return to constitutional government.

Mr. RANKIN. I was not advocating any particular candidate.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina seemed to be finding fault with either General MacArthur or with our colleague from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER]. I could not determine whom he was criticizing.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and include therein an address.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DRAFT BOARDS AND DEFERMENTS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, in view of the resentment surrounding the drafting of married men with families and the recommendations of General Hershey, Director of Selective Service, to defer their induction, I was under the impression that all those over 30 years of age would not be drafted by reason of the fact that the records of the War Department conclusively prove that they cannot stand the rigorous training and that very few could be used in combat service. It was my understanding that the draft boards would heed the instructions of General Hershey. However, while at home in Chicago my attention was called to the fact that the draft boards still refused to defer married men from 32 and up to 38 years of age with families and, at the same time, continued to grant deferments to young men from 18 to 26 years of age who are engaged in industry and on the farms. Naturally there is resentment against such practice and the administration is held responsible when, in fact, all these draft boards have been appointed by the Governors of the various States and in my city nearly all those serving on the draft boards are Republicans. Consequently, I will insist and demand, as I did a year ago, that the board members be given strict instructions covering deferments and in the event they refuse to comply with such instructions that they shall be excused from further service and fair and independent members named to replace them.

Mr. Speaker, I have received reports on deferments in several plants and I am informed that in most instances where young men are exempted, older men could easily take their places. I feel that this practice should no longer be countenanced and that it will be in the interest of the country if older men replace these young workers as it will result in the saving of millions of dollars in the form of allowances and allotments to the wives and children of men taken into the service.

I feel that it is manifestly unfair to charge the administration with being responsible for these conditions, espe-

cially in the Midwest, where all these boards have been appointed by Republican Governors and are composed of nearly all Republican members.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next after the disposition of matters on the Speaker's table and other special orders I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

TO EXPEDITE PAYMENT FOR LAND ACQUIRED DURING WAR PERIOD

The Clerk called the first bill on the Consent Calendar, S. 919, to expedite the payment for land acquired during the war period.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

FERTILIZERS, FEEDS, ETC., THAT MAY BE DISTRIBUTED BY GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3405, making certain regulations with reference to fertilizers, feeds, nursery stock, or seeds that may be distributed by agencies of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AMENDING PUBLIC LAW 537, SEVENTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS, APPROVED MAY 2, 1942

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2908, to amend Public Law 537, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved May 2, 1942.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

TO CREATE THE WAR SHIPPING FIELD SERVICE

The Clerk called the next bill, House Joint Resolution 182, to create the war shipping field service.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

TO ESTABLISH A BOARD OF VISITORS FOR THE UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

The Clerk called the next bill, Senate Joint Resolution 77, to establish a board of visitors for the United States Merchant Marine Academy.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, this is a matter about which I wrote the Speaker. I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

COMPUTATION OF DOUBLE-TIME CREDIT AWARDED BETWEEN 1898 AND 1912 IN DETERMINING RETIRED PAY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1675, to amend section 9 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 (Public Law 607) by providing for the computation of double-time credit awarded between 1898 and 1912 in determining retired pay.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, prior to 1912 anyone serving in the armed forces beyond the continental limits of the United States was given a double-time credit for that service. That provision, however, was repealed by the Congress in 1912.

This bill seeks to give to those persons who served outside the United States in the armed forces in the period between 1898 and 1912 double-time credit for that service; but in the drafting of the bill itself it is worded in such a way that a person might have served outside the United States during those dates for a period of but 2, 3, or 4 years and go on the retired roll at the maximum retired pay now allowed for any retired person in that particular grade.

I have discussed this phase of the bill with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY], author of the bill, and he has agreed to make such correction in the bill itself.

Mr. KILDAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KILDAY. I have at the Clerk's desk an amendment which I am sure will cure the situation the gentleman mentions. I believe he is correct. I will offer the amendment at the proper time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the third paragraph of section 9 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 (Public Law 607) approved June 16, 1942, is amended to read as follows:

"Every enlisted man paid under the provisions of this section shall receive an increase of 5 percent of the base pay of his grade for each 3 years of service up to 30 years. Such service shall be active Federal service in any of the services mentioned in the title of this act or reserve components thereof; service in the active National Guard

of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia; and service in the enlisted Reserve Corps of the Army, the Naval Reserve, the Marine Corps Reserve, and the Coast Guard Reserve: *Provided*, That retired enlisted men and warrant officers heretofore or hereafter retired who served beyond the continental limits of the United States between 1898 and 1912, such service having been computed under previous laws as double time toward retirement, shall be entitled to receive the maximum pay now provided for the grade in which retired."

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KILDAY:

On page 2, line 12, after the word "maximum" insert the word "retired."

On page 2, line 8, after the word "retired" insert "with credit for 30 years' service in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps and."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATURALIZATION OF CERTAIN ALIEN VETERANS OF THE WORLD WAR

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4238, providing for the naturalization of certain alien veterans of the World War.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That a new section is hereby inserted between sections 323 and 324 of the act entitled "An act to revise and codify the nationality laws of the United States into a comprehensive nationality code," approved October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1149):

"Sec. 323a. A person who was a member of the military or naval forces of the United States at any time after April 5, 1917, and before November 12, 1918, or at any time after April 20, 1898, and before July 5, 1902, or who served on the Mexican border as a member of the Regular Army or National Guard from June 1916 to April 1917, who is not an alien ineligible to citizenship, who was not at any time during such period or thereafter separated from such forces under other than honorable conditions, who was not a conscientious objector who performed no military duty whatever or refused to wear the uniform, and who was not at any time during such period or thereafter discharged from the military or naval forces on account of his alienage, shall, if he has resided in the United States continuously for at least 2 years pursuant to a legal admission for permanent residence in lieu of the usual 5 years' residence within the United States and 6 months' residence within the State of his residence at the time of filing the petition for naturalization, during all of which 2-year period he has behaved as a person of good moral character, be entitled at any time within 1 year after the date of approval of this act to naturalization upon compliance with all of the requirements of the naturalization laws, except that—

"(1) no declaration of intention shall be required;

"(2) no certificate of arrival shall be required unless such person's admission to the United States was subsequent to March 3, 1924; and

"(3) no residence within the jurisdiction of the court shall be required.

"Such petitioner shall verify his petition for naturalization by the affidavits of at least two credible witnesses who are citizens of the United States, or shall furnish the depositions of two such witnesses made in accord-

ance with the requirements of subsection (e) of section 327 of the Nationality Act of 1940, to prove the required residence, good moral character, attachment to the principles of the Constitution of the United States, and favorable disposition toward the good order and happiness of the United States. On applications filed for any benefits under this act, the requirement of fees for naturalization documents is hereby waived."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 19, strike out "date of approval of this act" and insert in lieu thereof "effective date of this section."

Page 3, line 14, strike out the word "Act" and insert in lieu thereof the word "section."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill providing for the naturalization of certain alien veterans of the Spanish-American War, the First World War, and members of the Regular Army or National Guard who served on the Mexican border from June 1916 to April 1917."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELIEF OF STARVING PEOPLES OF EUROPE

The Clerk called the next bill, House Resolution 221.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the House resolution?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I notice that there are 13 whereases to this bill. May I ask the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs whether he feels that this is going to be the practice when he brings out legislation to insert 13 or more whereases?

Mr. BLOOM. I may say to the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, that it is not up to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs to say whether the whereases are going to be in there or not. The whereases are not printed when the bill is finally passed as an act or anything else. They are left off. That is the general rule in connection with all bills and resolutions. The whereases are not included.

Mr. KEAN. Do they add anything to the bill?

Mr. BLOOM. The gentleman had better ask the introducer of the resolution. It is just explanatory, that is all.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the House resolution?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the House resolution, as follows:

Whereas the democratic countries of France, Belgium, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Greece, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, and others have been invaded and occupied; and

Whereas these countries which are allied with us in the cause of democracy resisted to the limit of their strength the onrush of invading forces; and

Whereas the usual economic processes of these countries have been completely dislocated as a result of being occupied by invading forces; and

Whereas the food supplies of all these nations are dangerously exhausted due to requisition of native food supplies by the Germans, and inability to secure their usual imports through the blockade; and

Whereas no relief can be brought to them unless there be international action through which their native supplies can be protected and imports be made through the blockade; and

Whereas starvation has already begun; and

Whereas a plan for feeding the people of Greece has been in effect for several months in Greece under supervision of the Swedish and Swiss Governments and the International Red Cross; and

Whereas after 6 months' trial this relief has been certified by the State Department as working satisfactorily and without benefit to the Germans; and

Whereas the Governments of Belgium, Norway, and Poland have requested that their people be given relief; and

Whereas there are food surpluses available in the United States and in South America; and

Whereas many of the invaded countries have money with which to purchase the food needed to keep their people alive and have signified their desire to use funds for that purpose; and

Whereas the Swedish Government has ships not available to the Allies which could be used for transportation; and

Whereas the specter of mass starvation among friendly and noncombatant women and children is a tragedy that the compassionate heart of America wants to avert; and

Whereas France, Belgium, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Greece, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, and others have lived in friendship with the United States during our entire national existence, and have sent us millions of our most useful and helpful American citizens, and now have no means whatever of securing the necessary agreements by which this disaster can be averted: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives does express the conviction that immediate steps should be taken to extend the Greek experiment and thereby prevent this impending tragedy of mass starvation heretofore named; and be it further

Resolved, That the House of Representatives respectfully urges that the Government of the United States, through the Secretary of State, endeavor as quickly as possible to work out, in cooperation with the British Government and the Governments of Sweden, Switzerland, and the accredited representatives of the other governments concerned, the setting up of systematic and definite relief for all stricken and hungry countries where the need is now the most acute; this relief to be based on agreements by the belligerents for the protection of the native and imported food supplies, with rigid safeguarding of such relief so that no military advantage whatever may accrue to the civil populations or armed forces of the invading nations.

The House resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMPENSATION OF THE REGISTERS OF THE DISTRICT LAND OFFICES

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 866, to fix the compensation of registers of the district land offices in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That commencing 60 days after the approval of this act the positions of registers of the district land offices

shall become subject to the Classification Act of 1923 (42 Stat. 1493; 5 U. S. C., sec. 661, and the following), as amended: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall operate to reduce the basic annual compensation of any register below the amount paid to such officer, exclusive of overtime pay, during the fiscal year immediately preceding the enactment of this act.

SEC. 2. Any moneys heretofore appropriated for the salaries and commissions of registers shall be available for the payment of the compensation of the registers under the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated such additional amounts as may be necessary for that purpose.

SEC. 3. No provision of this act shall relieve any public land applicant or claimant from the necessity of making payment of fees, commissions, or other moneys required by law or regulation. Commencing 60 days after the approval of this act, the registers shall not receive any compensation based on fees, commissions, or other receipts and all amounts collected by them shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States.

SEC. 4. Sections 2237 and 2240 of the Revised Statutes and the act of May 21, 1928 (45 Stat. 684; 43 U. S. C., sec. 80), as amended, are hereby repealed and all other provisions of law inconsistent with this act are repealed to the extent of such inconsistency.

SEC. 5. The provisions of this act shall not extend to the Territory of Alaska.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXAMINATION NOT TO BE REQUIRED AS A CONDITION TO APPOINTMENT OF CERTAIN POSTMASTERS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1565, relating to the appointment of postmasters.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That no postmaster at an office of the fourth class shall be required, in the event such office is advanced to the third class, to pass any competitive or noncompetitive examination as a condition to appointment or service as postmaster at the office so advanced; and no postmaster at an office of the third class shall be required, in the event such office is relegated to the fourth class, to pass any competitive or noncompetitive examination as a condition to appointment or service as postmaster at the office so relegated.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF PREFERENCE TO VETERANS WHO DESIRE TO COMPETE FOR POSITIONS IN THE FEDERAL CIVIL SERVICE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4115, to give honorably discharged veterans, their widows, and the wives of disabled veterans, who themselves are not qualified, preference in employment where Federal funds are disbursed.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice as it will come up under suspension of the rules today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK]?

There was no objection.

ELIMINATION OF THE PAYMENT OF INTEREST ON REFUND CLAIMS COVERING SERVICE OF 1 YEAR OR LESS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4292, to amend section 12 (b) of the act of May 29, 1930, as amended.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 12 (b) of the act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is amended by inserting, immediately following the first proviso, the following: "Except that no such interest shall be allowed on any separation unless the service covered thereby aggregates more than 1 year."

SEC. 2. That the last proviso of section 12 (b) of the act of May 29, 1930, is amended by inserting after "so returned to an officer or employee" the following: "with respect to which interest was paid."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, strike out all of lines 8, 9, 10, and 11.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMPUTATION OF INTEREST ON CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT FUND

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4320, relating to the computation of interest on contributions to the civil service retirement fund returned to employees upon their separation from the service.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 12 (b), as amended, of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended (U. S. C., title 5, sec. 724 (b)), is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following: "In computing interest under this subsection, a fractional part of a month shall be disregarded unless it amounts to more than half a month, in which case it shall be considered as a full month."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMITTING THE FILLING OF A VACANCY IN THE OFFICE OF DISTRICT JUDGE, DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3732, to repeal the prohibition against the filling of a vacancy in the office of district judge in the district of New Jersey.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provision of subsection (a) of section 2 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of additional district and circuit judges," approved May 24, 1940 (54 Stat. 219), which reads: "Provided, That the first vacancy occurring in the office of district judge in each of said districts shall not be filled," be, and it hereby is, repealed insofar as it relates to the office of district judge in the district of New Jersey.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING ACQUISITION OF ADDITIONAL LANDS AND FLOWAGE EASEMENTS FOR PLEASANT HILL RESERVOIR, OHIO

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2752, to authorize the acquisition of additional lands and flowage easements for the Pleasant Hill Reservoir, Ohio, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, with the consent of the owners thereof, the Secretary of War in his discretion shall acquire, on behalf of the United States, title in fee simple to, or flowage easements over, such additional lands in the vicinity of Perrysville, Ohio, as the Chief of Engineers may find to be subjected to flooding as a result of the impounding of water in the Pleasant Hill Reservoir, a unit in the Muskingum watershed flood-control project. If the owner of any land found to be subjected to flooding does not desire to sell, or grant a flowage easement over, such land to the United States, he may present to the Secretary of War from time to time claims for damages on account of the flooding of such land. The Secretary of War shall thereupon determine the amount he may find to be due such claimant and certify such amount to Congress as a legal claim for payment out of funds which are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the payment of such claims.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4, after the word "War", insert "in his discretion."

Page 2, line 1, strike out all of the bill after the word "project."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BENEFITS TO MERCHANT SEAMEN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4163, to amend section 2 of Public Law 17, Seventy-eighth Congress, relating to functions of the War Shipping Administration, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 (relating to seamen's insurance) of the act entitled "An act to amend and clarify certain provisions of law relating to functions of the War Shipping Administration, and for other purposes," approved March 24, 1943 (Public Law 17, 78th Cong.; 57 Stat. 45), is amended as follows:

(1) By inserting after the first sentence of subsection (b) thereof a new sentence to read as follows: "There shall be no recovery of any money paid on account of insurance provided for the master, officers, or members of the crew of, or individuals transported on, any vessel under this subsection or under subtitle—Insurance of title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, from any person who in the judgment of the Administrator, War Shipping Administration, is without fault, and when in the judgment of the Administrator such recovery would defeat the purposes of benefits otherwise authorized or would be against equity and good conscience."

(2) By adding at the end of said section new subsections to read as follows:

"(c) The Administrator, War Shipping Administration, is also authorized to make adequate payments to a master, officer, or member of the crew of, or any persons transported on, a vessel owned by or chartered to

the Maritime Commission or the War Shipping Administration or operated by, or for the account of, or at the direction or under the control of the Commission or the Administration, for permanent total or partial disability as long as such disability resulting from causes related to the war effort whether heretofore or hereafter arising exists.

"(d) The War Shipping Administration shall have the right of intervention and a lien and right of recovery in the cases and to the extent of any payments paid and payable under this section or under subtitle—insurance of title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, in the manner provided in the last paragraph of subsection (c) of section 105 of the act approved December 2, 1942 (Public Law 784, 77th Cong.; 42 U. S. C., sec. 1701), as amended by Public Law 216, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved December 23, 1943. Any amounts recovered under this provision shall be covered into the marine and war-risk insurance fund, War Shipping Administration."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ABOLISHMENT OF THE JACKSON HOLE NATIONAL MONUMENT

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2241, to abolish the Jackson Hole National Monument as created by Presidential Proclamation No. 2578, dated March 15, 1943, and to restore the area embraced within and constituting said monument to its status as part of the Teton National Forest.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN]?

There was no objection.

ESTABLISHMENT OF HARPERS FERRY NATIONAL MONUMENT

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3524, to provide for the establishment of the Harpers Ferry National Monument.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized to accept donations of land, interest in land, buildings, structures, and other property in the vicinity of Harpers Ferry, W. Va., not to exceed 1,500 acres, as the Secretary of the Interior may deem necessary to carry out the purposes of this act, and donations of funds for the purchase and maintenance thereof, the evidence of title to such lands to be satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior. Any Federal land within the area designated by the Secretary of the Interior as necessary for monument purposes shall be transferred to the administration of the Department of the Interior and when so transferred shall become a part of the monument: *Provided,* That the Federal department or agency having administration over such land shall agree in advance to such transfer.

SEC. 2. The property acquired under the provisions of section 1 of this act shall constitute the Harpers Ferry National Monument and shall be a public national memorial commemorating the Harpers Ferry, campaigns of the War between the States (Civil War) and the great cause of human freedom. The Director of the National Park Service under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, shall have the supervision, management, and control of such national monu-

ment and shall maintain and preserve it for the benefit and enjoyment of the people of the United States, subject to the provisions of the act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), entitled "An act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes," as amended.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to—

(1) Maintain, either in an existing structure acquired under the provisions of section 1 of this act or in a building constructed by him for the purpose, a museum for relics and records pertaining to historic events that took place at Harpers Ferry, and for other relics of national and patriotic interest, and to accept on behalf of the United States, for installation in such museum, articles which may be offered as additions to the museum; and

(2) Construct roads and facilities and mark with monuments, tablets, or otherwise, points of interest within the boundaries of the Harpers Ferry National Monument.

SEC. 4. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 11, after the word "commemorating", strike out the word "the" and insert "historical events at or near."

Page 2, line 12, strike out "campaigns of the War between the States (Civil War) and the great cause of human freedom."

Page 3, line 10, after the word "the", insert "improvement and maintenance on the land and sites donated under the."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT TO EXPEDITING ACT

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3054, to amend the Expediting Act.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act of February 11, 1903, chapter 544, be amended to read as follows:

"In every suit in equity brought in any district court of the United States under any of said acts, wherein the United States is complainant, an appeal from the final decree of the district court will lie only to the Supreme Court and must be taken within 60 days from the entry thereof: *Provided, however,* That if, upon any such appeal, it shall be found that, by reason of disqualification, there shall not be a quorum of Justices of the Supreme Court qualified to participate in the consideration of the case on the merits, then, in lieu of a decision by the Supreme Court, the case shall be immediately sent by the Supreme Court to the senior circuit judge of the circuit in which is located the district in which the suit was brought and it shall be the duty of the senior circuit judge to designate immediately three circuit judges of said circuit, one of whom shall be himself and the other two of whom shall be the two circuit judges next in order of seniority to himself, to hear and determine the appeal in such case and it shall be the duty of the judges so designated to assign the case for argument at the earliest practicable date and to participate in the determination thereof and the decision of the three circuit judges, or of a majority in number thereof, shall be final and there shall be no review of such decision by appeal or certiorari or otherwise.

"If, by reason of death or otherwise, any of said three circuit judges shall be unable to participate in the decision of said case, any

such vacancy or vacancies shall be filled by the senior circuit judge by designating one or more other circuit judges of the said circuit next in order of seniority and, if there be none such available, he shall fill any such vacancy or vacancies by designating one or more circuit judges from another circuit or circuits, designating, in each case the oldest available circuit judge, in order of seniority, in the circuit from which he is selected, such designation to be only with the consent of the senior circuit judge of any such other circuit.

"This amendment shall apply to every case pending before the Supreme Court of the United States on or after the date of enactment of this act."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That section 2 of the act of February 11, 1903, chapter 544, be amended to read as follows:

"In every suit in equity brought in any district court of the United States under any of said acts, wherein the United States is complainant, an appeal from the final decree of the district court will lie only to the Supreme Court and must be taken within 60 days from the entry thereof: *Provided, however,* That if, upon any such appeal, it shall be found that, by reason of disqualification, there shall not be a quorum of Justices of the Supreme Court qualified to participate in the consideration of the case on the merits, then, in lieu of a decision by the Supreme Court, the case shall be immediately sent by the Supreme Court to the circuit court of appeals of the circuit in which is located the district in which the suit was brought and it shall be the duty of the senior circuit judge of said circuit court of appeals, qualified to participate in the consideration of the case on the merits, to designate immediately three circuit judges of said court, one of whom shall be himself and the other two of whom shall be the two circuit judges next in order of seniority to himself, to hear and determine the appeal in such case and it shall be the duty of the court, so comprised, to assign the case for argument at the earliest practicable date and to hear and determine the same, and the decision of the three circuit judges so designated, or of a majority in number thereof, shall be final and there shall be no review of such decision by appeal or certiorari or otherwise.

"If, by reason of death or otherwise, any of said three circuit judges shall be unable to participate in the decision of said case, any such vacancy or vacancies shall be filled by the senior circuit judge by designating one or more other circuit judges of the said circuit next in order of seniority and, if there be none such available, he shall fill any such vacancy or vacancies by designating one or more circuit judges from another circuit or circuits, designating, in each case, the oldest available circuit judge, in order of seniority, in the circuit from which he is selected, such designation to be only with the consent of the senior circuit judge of any such other circuit."

"This amendment shall apply to every case pending before the Supreme Court of the United States on or after the date of enactment of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, that concludes the call of the eligible bills on the Consent Calendar for today.

**PENSIONS TO CERTAIN UNREMARIED
DEPENDENT WIDOWS OF CIVIL WAR
VETERANS WHO WERE MARRIED TO THE
VETERAN SUBSEQUENT TO JUNE 26,
1905**

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 86) to grant pensions to certain unremarried dependent widows of Civil War veterans who were married to the veteran subsequent to June 26, 1905.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the dependent unremarried widow of a Civil War veteran who is barred from the receipt of pension because her marriage to the veteran occurred subsequent to June 26, 1905, but who is otherwise entitled to such pension either under the act of May 1, 1920 (41 Stat. 585), or under the act of June 9, 1930 (46 Stat. 528), shall be entitled to pension in her own right under said acts at the rates and under the conditions specified therein and to the additional pension provided for minor and helpless children in the act of May 1, 1920, provided she married the veteran 10 years prior to his death and lived with him continuously from the date of marriage to the date of his death except where there was a separation which was due to misconduct of or procured by the veteran without the fault of the widow: *Provided*, That if pension has been granted to an insane, idiotic, or otherwise helpless child of the veteran or to a child or children of the veteran under 16 years of age, the widow shall not be entitled to the pension authorized in this act until the pension to the child or children terminates, unless such child or children be a member or members of her family and cared for by her; and when these conditions are fulfilled and the pension is granted to the widow, payment of pension to such child or children shall cease; except that in the event the amount being paid to such child or children is less than the amount authorized to the widow by this act, then the difference between said amounts will be paid to the widow: *Provided further*, That no pension shall be payable under this act to a widow under 60 years of age.

SEC. 2. Payment of pension as provided by this act shall be effective from the date of receipt of application in the Veterans' Administration, in the form prescribed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, but not prior to the date of enactment of this act. Pension under this act shall not be paid to the widow of a veteran of the Civil War who has remarried either once or more than once, and upon the remarriage of such a widow her pension shall be terminated. The penal and forfeiture provisions of the pension laws providing pensions for veterans of the Civil War and their widows and dependents shall be applicable to the provisions of this act.

SEC. 3. No agent, attorney, or other person shall, directly or indirectly, solicit, contract for, charge, or receive any fee or compensation for preparing or assisting in the preparation of the necessary papers in the application to the Veterans' Administration for benefits under this act. Any person who shall, directly or indirectly, solicit, contract for, charge, or receive any fee or compensation for such preparation or assistance shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and each and every offense shall be punishable by a fine of not more than \$500 or imprisonment at hard labor for not more than 2 years, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

HISTORY OF THE LEGISLATION

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, this bill, H. R. 86, is similar to bills that were reported by the Committee on Invalid Pensions during the Seventy-sixth and Seventy-seventh Congresses. Both bills were passed by the House without amendment or dissenting vote, and both bills were favorably reported by the Committee on Pensions of the United States Senate, but failed of enactment prior to the adjournment of the Congresses.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

This bill has for its purpose the granting of service pensions to a restricted group of Civil War widows who are not now eligible for service pensions because they were not married to the veteran prior to June 27, 1905.

Under existing service-pension laws, a widow of a Civil War veteran, if married to the veteran prior to June 27, 1905, may receive pension at the rate of \$30 per month if under 70 years of age, \$40 per month to those 70 years of age or over, or \$50 per month if married to the veteran during his Civil War service. Under the existing laws, remarriage of the widow subsequent to the death of the veteran is no bar to the receipt of pension if the subsequent remarriage was terminated or the remarriages were terminated without fault on the part of the widow. Under the provisions of this bill, if the widow has remarried subsequent to the veteran's death, she would be barred from receipt of pension thereunder. The provisions of existing law do not require that the widow show dependency. The bill requires that dependency be shown under regulations to be prescribed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. Under existing laws, as heretofore stated, pension is payable to a widow under 60 years of age, whereas under this bill it is required that the widow be at least 60 years of age in order to be eligible to receive benefits thereunder.

Under the provisions of this bill, a new group of widows would become eligible notwithstanding the present marriage delimiting date, June 27, 1905, and receive pension if otherwise entitled under the service-pension laws if marriage to the veteran occurred at least 10 years prior to the veteran's death and the widow had lived with the veteran continuously from the date of their marriage to the date of the veteran's death, except in those instances where separation is clearly the fault of the veteran.

ELIGIBILITY FOR BENEFITS

If this bill is enacted into law in its present form, the conditions on which award will be predicated are as follows:

First. No pension is payable under the act unless the widow is 60 years of age.

Second. Marriage to the veteran must have occurred at least 10 years prior to his death.

Third. The widow must have lived with the veteran continuously from the date of marriage to the date of the veteran's death, except in those instances where a separation is clearly the fault of the veteran.

Fourth. Dependency must be shown. This showing will be based upon regulations to be drafted by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and will presumably conform to the criteria now in force with respect to the dependency of mothers and fathers who are claimants for pension or compensation.

Fifth. The widow must have remained the lawful widow of the veteran. If she has remarried subsequent to his death, she is barred from receipt of pension under terms of the bill.

Sixth. The widow may not be granted pension while the veteran's child or children either helpless or under the age of 16 years are on the pension rolls, unless it is shown that the child or children are in her care and custody. However, if the rate being paid the child or children is less than that the widow would receive if the child or children were in her care, then any difference may be paid her.

Seventh. The widow will be barred from receiving pension if she is found to be living in open and notorious adulterous cohabitation subsequent to the veteran's death.

Eighth. The veteran must have served 90 days or more in the Civil War, or if he served less than 90 days, must have been discharged for disability incurred in the service in line of duty.

COST OF THE LEGISLATION

The Veterans' Administration furnished the revised estimate to the committee as to the cost, and it is estimated that approximately 2,000 new cases would be eligible for pension at the cost of approximately \$960,000 for the first year. There are also 400 widows now pensioned under special acts that would be entitled under the provisions of this bill, and it is estimated that the cost would be \$44,000 for the first year. The total estimated annual cost would be approximately \$1,004,000, affecting 2,400 widows. However, the Veterans' Administration has informed the committee that, based upon their experience, it is not likely that more than one-half of the new cases will apply the first year, which would reduce the estimated cost for the first year to \$524,000, affecting 1,400 widows.

JUSTIFICATION OF THE LEGISLATION

There has been recently approved a Spanish War pension bill, which advanced the marriage date from September 1, 1922, to January 1, 1938. There was also approved an Indian war pension bill that contained this provision, identical with this bill—namely, that a dependent unremarried widow, in order to secure pension, must have attained the age of 60 years and was married to the veteran 10 or more years prior to his

death. Prior to the enactment of this law, widows of Indian war veterans who married subsequent to March 3, 1917, were denied a service pension.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in two respects, in one to include some correspondence I have had with Secretary Stimson, and in the other to include a short poem about Mr. South Trimble on his birthday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein certain brief newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD upon the subject of the St. Lawrence seaway project and include therein three editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on three subjects and include therein two editorials from the Chicago Times and another editorial from the Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

VETERANS' PREFERENCE IN THE FEDERAL CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 4115) to give honorably discharged veterans, their widows, and the wives of disabled veterans, who themselves are not qualified, preference in employment where Federal funds are disbursed, with the amendments adopted by the committee.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Veterans' Preference Act of 1944."

SEC. 2. In certification for appointment, in appointment, in reinstatement, in reemployment, and in retention in civilian positions in all establishments, agencies, bureaus, administrations, projects, and departments of the Government, permanent or temporary, and in either (a) the classified civil service; (b) the unclassified civil service; (c) any temporary or emergency establishment, agency, bureau, administration, project, and department created by acts of Congress or Presidential Executive order; and (d) the civil service of the District of Columbia, preference shall be given to (1) those ex-service men and women who have served honorably in any branch of the armed forces of the United States who have established the present existence of a service-connected disability or who are receiving compensation, disability retirement benefits, or pension by reason of public laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, the War Depart-

ment or the Navy Department; (2) the wives of such service-connected disabled ex-service men and the husbands of such service-connected disabled ex-servicewomen as have themselves been unable to qualify for any civil-service appointment; (3) the unmarried widows of deceased ex-servicemen who served honorably in any branch of the armed forces of the United States during any war, or in any campaign or expedition (for which a campaign badge has been authorized), the widows of any deceased ex-servicewomen who have served honorably in any branch of the armed forces of the United States during any war or in any campaign or expedition (for which a campaign badge has been authorized) who are supporting any children under 18 years of age of such deceased ex-servicewomen; and (4) those honorably discharged ex-service men and women who have served in any branch of the armed forces of the United States during any war, or in any campaign or expedition (for which a campaign badge has been authorized).

SEC. 3. In all examinations to determine the qualifications of applicants for entrance into the service 10 points shall be added to the earned ratings of those persons included under section 2 (1), (2), and (3), and 5 points shall be added to the earned ratings of those persons included under section 2 (4) of this act: *Provided*, That in examinations for the positions of guards, elevator operators, messengers, and custodians competition shall be restricted to persons entitled to preference under this act as long as persons entitled to preference are available and during the present war and for a period of 5 years following the termination of the present war as proclaimed by the President or by a concurrent resolution of the Congress for such other positions as may from time to time be determined by the President.

SEC. 4. In examinations where experience is an element of qualification, time spent in the military or naval service of the United States shall be credited in a veteran's rating where his or her actual employment in a similar vocation to that for which he or she is examined was interrupted by such military or naval service. In all examinations to determine the qualifications of a veteran applicant, credit shall be given for all valuable experience, including experience gained in religious, civic, welfare, service, and organizational activities, regardless of whether any compensation was received therefor.

SEC. 5. In determining qualifications for examination, appointment, promotion, retention, transfer, or reinstatement, with respect to preference eligibles, the Civil Service Commission or other examining agency shall waive requirements as to age, height, and weight, provided any such requirement is not essential to the performance of the duties of the position for which examination is given. The Civil Service Commission or other examining agency, after giving due consideration to the recommendation of any accredited physician in the service of the United States, shall waive the physical requirements in the case of any veteran, provided such veteran is, in the opinion of the Civil Service Commission or other examining agency, physically able to discharge efficiently the duties of the position for which the examination is given. No minimum educational requirement will be prescribed in any civil-service examination except for such scientific, technical, or professional positions the duties of which the Civil Service Commission decides cannot be performed by a person who does not have such education. The Commission shall make a part of its public records its reasons for such decision.

SEC. 6. Preference eligibles shall not be subject to the provisions of section 9 of the Civil Service Act concerning two or more members of family in the service, or to the provisions of section 2 of that act concerning

apportionment of appointments in the Government departments in the District of Columbia among the several States and Territories according to population, but may be required to furnish evidence of residence and domicile.

SEC. 7. The names of preference eligibles shall be entered on the appropriate registers or lists of eligibles in accordance with their respective augmented ratings, and the name of a preference eligible shall be entered ahead of all others having the same rating: *Provided*, That, except for positions in the professional and scientific services for which the entrance salary is over \$3,000 per annum, the names of all qualified preference eligibles, entitled to 10 points in addition to their earned ratings, shall be placed at the top of the appropriate civil-service register or employment list, in accordance with their respective augmented ratings.

SEC. 8. When, in accordance with civil-service laws and rules, a nominating or appointing officer shall request certification of eligibles for appointment purposes, the Civil Service Commission shall certify, from the top of the appropriate register of eligibles, a number of names sufficient to permit the nominating or appointing officer to consider at least three names in connection with each vacancy. The nominating or appointing officer shall make selection for each vacancy from not more than the highest three names available for appointment on such certification, unless objection shall be made, and sustained by the Commission, to one or more of the persons certified, for any proper and adequate reason, as may be prescribed in the rules promulgated by the Civil Service Commission: *Provided*, That an appointing officer who passes over a veteran eligible and selects a nonveteran shall file with the Civil Service Commission his reasons in writing for so doing, which shall become a part of the record of such veteran eligible, and shall be made available upon request to the veteran or his designated representative; the Civil Service Commission is directed to determine the sufficiency of such submitted reasons and, if found insufficient, shall require such appointing officer to submit more detailed information in support thereof; the findings of the Civil Service Commission as to the sufficiency or insufficiency of such reasons shall be transmitted to and considered by such appointing officer, and a copy thereof shall be sent to the veteran eligible or to his designated representative upon request therefor: *Provided further*, That if, upon certification, reasons deemed sufficient by the Civil Service Commission for passing over his name shall three times have been given by an appointing officer, certification of his name for appointment may thereafter be discontinued, prior notice of which shall be sent to the veteran eligible. Whenever in the Postal Service two or more substitutes are appointed on the same day, they shall be promoted to the regular force in the order in which their names appeared on the civil-service register from which they were originally appointed, whenever there are substitutes of the required sex who are eligible and will accept, unless such vacancies are filled by transfer or reinstatement.

SEC. 9. In the unclassified Federal, and District of Columbia, civil service, and in all other positions and employment hereinbefore referred to in (c) of section 2 hereof, the nominating or appointing officer or employing official shall make selection from the qualified applicants in accordance with the provisions of this act.

SEC. 10. The Civil Service Commission is authorized and directed to hold an examination, during the next succeeding quarterly period, for any position to which any appointment has been made within the preceding 3 years, for any person included under

section 2 (1), (2), and (3) of this act upon application for examination for any such position.

Sec. 11. The Civil Service Commission is hereby authorized to promulgate appropriate rules and regulations for the administration and enforcement of the provisions of this act.

Sec. 12. In any reduction in personnel in any civilian service of any Federal agency, competing employees shall be released in accordance with Civil Service Commission regulations which shall give due effect to tenure of employment, military preference, length of service, and efficiency ratings: *Provided*, That the length of time spent in active service in the armed forces of the United States of each such employee shall be credited in computing length of total service: *Provided further*, That preference employees whose efficiency ratings are "good" or better shall be retained in preference to all other competing employees and that preference employees whose efficiency ratings are below "good" shall be retained in preference to competing nonpreference employees who have equal or lower efficiency ratings: *And provided further*, That when any or all of the functions of any agency are transferred to, or when any agency is replaced by, some other agency, or agencies, all preference employees in the function or functions transferred or in the agency which is replaced by some other agency shall first be transferred to the replacing agency, or agencies, for employment in positions for which they are qualified, before such agency, or agencies, shall appoint additional employees from any other source for such positions.

Sec. 13. Any preference eligible who has resigned or who has been dismissed or furloughed may, at the request of any appointing officer, be certified for, and appointed to, any position for which he may be eligible in the civil service, Federal, or District of Columbia, or in any establishment, agency, bureau, administration, project, or department, temporary or permanent.

Sec. 14. No permanent or indefinite preference eligible, who has completed a probationary or trial period employed in the civil service, or in any establishment, agency, bureau, administration, project, or department, hereinbefore referred to shall be discharged, suspended for more than 30 days, furloughed without pay, reduced in rank or compensation, or debarred for future appointment except for such cause as will promote the efficiency of the service and for reasons given in writing, and the person whose discharge, suspension for more than 30 days, furlough without pay, or reduction in rank or compensation is sought shall have at least 30 days' advance written notice (except where there is reasonable cause to believe the employee to be guilty of a crime for which a sentence of imprisonment can be imposed), stating any and all reasons, specifically and in detail, for any such proposed action; such preference eligible shall be allowed a reasonable time for answering the same personally and in writing, and for furnishing affidavits in support of such answer, and shall have the right to appeal to the Civil Service Commission from an adverse decision of the administrative officer so acting, such appeal to be made in writing within a reasonable length of time after the date of receipt of notice of such adverse decision: *Provided*, That such preference eligible shall have the right to make a personal appearance, or an appearance through a designated representative, in accordance with such reasonable rules and regulations as may be issued by the Civil Service Commission; after investigation and consideration of the evidence submitted, the Civil Service Commission shall submit its findings and recommendations to the proper administrative officer and shall send copies of same to the appellant or to his designated representative: *Provided further*, That the

Civil Service Commission may declare any such preference eligible who may have been dismissed or furloughed without pay to be eligible for the provisions of section 15 hereof.

Sec. 15. Any preference eligible, who has been furloughed, or separated without delinquency or misconduct, upon request, shall have his name placed on all appropriate civil-service registers and/or on all employment lists, for every position for which his qualifications have been established, as maintained by the Civil Service Commission, or as shall be maintained by any agency or project of the Federal Government, or of the District of Columbia, in the order as provided in section 7 hereof, and shall then be eligible for recertification and reappointment in the order and according to the procedure as provided for in sections 7 and 8 hereof. No appointment shall be made from an examination register of eligibles when there are three or more names of preference eligibles on any appropriate reemployment list for the position to be filled.

Sec. 16. Any preference eligible who has resigned shall, upon request to the Civil Service Commission, have his name again placed on all proper civil-service registers for which he may have been qualified, in the order as provided for in section 7 hereof, and shall then be eligible for recertification and reappointment in the order, and according to the procedure, as provided for in sections 7 and 8 hereof.

Sec. 17. The term "Civil Service Commission" or "Commission" as used in this act shall mean the present United States Civil Service Commission or any body or person who may by law succeed to its powers and duties, or any of them, or which or who may be designated by law to perform any specific duty and possess any specific power concerning matters covered by this act.

Sec. 18. All acts and parts of acts inconsistent with the provisions hereof are hereby modified to conform herewith, and this act shall not be construed to take away from any preference eligible any rights heretofore granted to, or possessed by, him under any existing law, Executive order, civil-service rule or regulation, of any department of the Government or officer thereof.

Sec. 19. It shall be the authority and duty of the Civil Service Commission in all cases under the classified civil service to make and enforce appropriate rules and regulations to carry into full effect the provisions, intent, and purpose of this act and such Executive orders as may be issued pursuant thereto and in furtherance thereof.

Sec. 20. Nothing contained in this act is intended to apply to any position or appointment which by the Congress is required to be confirmed by, or made with, the advice and consent of the United States Senate: *Provided, however*, That the provisions of this act shall apply to appointments under Public Law No. 720, Seventy-fifth Congress, third session, approved June 25, 1938.

Sec. 21. If any part of this act shall be found to be unconstitutional, the rest of it shall be considered as in full force and effect.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I demand a second, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES], the author of the bill.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, from the very inception of our Republic our Government has extended certain special benefits and privileges to the men who have offered their lives in the defense of the country and its institutions. This is a sound principle. Those who are selected from among us to wear the uniform and to serve the country on the firing line are certainly entitled, when peace has been won through their efforts, to be selected and given special consideration and preference in employment by their Government in peacetimes. That is a reward to an American who has willingly and gladly offered his life in an effort to save and to sanctify for us the principles of government under which we live, and which by their sterling efforts is being handed on to posterity.

Most of the provisions of this particular bill have been in practice for a number of years. Since World War No. 1 various Executive and administrative orders have extended to veterans throughout this country privileges in Government services. However, it is a matter of regret to me that the Congress has not heretofore established by law preference to veterans in Government employment. This is the first step in that direction. We are laying down a broad, general policy, and in some instances we are being quite specific in this bill in providing preference for veterans in Government. The biggest problem in the post-war period is providing jobs for able-bodied American citizens who have served in the armed forces. Jobs by which they can support themselves and their families; jobs which will permit them to retain their self-respect and feel that the country for which they have offered their all has not failed them.

When this war is over and our boys come home they should not be forced to tramp the streets looking for jobs, nor to live on charity. There should be a job ready and waiting in private enterprise or with the Government, Federal, State, and local, for every American fighting man when he comes home when victory has been won.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. I understand this bill presents for the first time recognition for the women as veterans.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. That is correct.

Mrs. BOLTON. And that this bill will apply the same to both men and women.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. That is correct, and I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio for bringing the matter to my attention. This bill does, for the first time, recognize the principle of preference for women in service and for the husbands or widowers of the ex-service-women.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I commend the gentleman and his committee on the timely steps that are being taken

in this measure. As I understand it, it is a qualifying, all-embracing measure, and I think the gentleman deserves a lot of credit for it.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the three great veterans' organizations, the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the Disabled American Veterans, have endorsed and recommended this legislation for passage.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. That is correct.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEARNEY. Can the gentleman inform me whether or not under this bill the men who receive a blue discharge are entitled to receive veterans' preference, or is it limited simply to those with an honorable discharge?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. It is limited to those who have honorably served, as I recall the provisions of the bill.

Mr. KEARNEY. The blue discharge is a discharge neither with honor nor without honor. The gentleman says this is limited to those men who are honorably discharged?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. That is my recollection.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMASON. I believe this is a very splendid bill. I am also sure it will receive the support of all the Members. However, I hope the distinguished author of the bill will point out for the benefit of the record wherein this bill gives added privileges or rights to male veterans. The gentleman from Ohio has made mention of the fact that women are now admitted, which is certainly the right and proper thing to do. There are some of us who have not been able to read the record in its entirety. I should like to know if this bill changes or alters the present laws, or in what respect it adds to existing law.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. The history of the present legislation is that for the past 8 years, originally as a member of the Committee on the Civil Service of the House and as a member of the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars, I sponsored for them at their request bills providing veterans' preference. Three hearings have been held upon the bills which they have requested me to introduce. Finally they came to a complete and unanimous agreement on this bill, the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the Disabled American Veterans, the three major vet-

erans' organizations. This bill has the unanimous support of the House Committee on the Civil Service and it has support of the President of the United States as expressed in a letter addressed to the chairman of this committee.

If you will refer to pages 3 and 4 of the committee report, you will find the comments of the committee with respect to the chief additions to existing rules and regulations with reference to preference extended to veterans.

Section 2 defines the groups or classes of veterans to whom preference is to be granted. It includes for the first time the husbands and widowers of service-connected disabled ex-servicewomen, because, as we know, this is the first time the Congress has recognized the status of women as ex-servicewomen in serving their country. They have done a magnificent job, as usual.

Section 3, in addition to carrying into law the present provisions of the civil-service rules providing for the addition of 10 points for disabled veterans and 5 points for others, provides that as long as persons entitled to preference are available, civil-service appointments for certain classes of positions, such as guards, elevator operators, messengers, and custodians, shall be available exclusively to veterans. We go one step further in that we authorize the President during this war and for a period of 5 years after the cessation of hostilities to set aside for the exclusive appointment of veterans certain types or classes of Government jobs.

In section 6 we waive the right of apportionment which has been set up in the Civil Service Act, under which jobs are apportioned to the District of Columbia and the various States and Territories according to population. We waive that provision with reference to the appointment of veterans, and we go further and waive section 9 of the Civil Service Act of 1883, concerning two or more members of a family in the service. In other words, we waive that provision of the original Civil Service Act which states that two or more members of a family shall not serve, and permit any number of veterans in the same family to obtain Government employment.

In section 7 we exempt to a certain extent from the provisions of this act preference for specially skilled jobs where the salaries are over \$3,000 per annum. However, less than 1 percent of Government employees are presently affected by that, and in normal times it would probably be less than 1 percent.

In section 8 we provide that when a veteran is passed over by an appointing agency the appointing officer must file his reasons in writing with the Civil Service Commission and the Civil Service Commission must make an investigation, and that the objections or reasons for failure to appoint a veteran who has been passed over must be made available to that veteran or to his representative upon request. That is new, and it strengthens the provision with reference to veterans' preference.

Section 12 provides for procedure in any reduction in personnel in any civilian service of any Federal agency, specific

provisions appearing with respect to the preferred status of veterans in retention. Provision is also made in this section directing that when any or all of the functions of any agency are transferred to, or when any agency is replaced by, some other agency, or agencies, all preference employees in the function or functions transferred or in the agency which is replaced by some other agency shall first be transferred to the replacing agency, or agencies, for employment in positions for which they are qualified, before such agency, or agencies, shall appoint additional employees from any other source for such positions.

Section 14 gives special preferences to veterans in the way of prior notice before they are discharged, suspended for more than 30 days, furloughed without pay, reduced in rank or compensation, or debarred for future appointment except for such cause as shall promote the efficiency of the service and for reasons given in writing. This section gives such a preference eligible the right to appeal to the Civil Service Commission from an adverse decision of any administrative officer, with the further right of making a personal appearance or an appearance through a designated representative, in accordance with the rules and regulations as may be issued by the Civil Service Commission.

Sections 15 and 16 relate to the preference granted veteran eligibles in connection with appropriate civil-service registers.

Section 20 provides that this proposal would not apply to positions where Senate confirmation is required; however, it would apply to postmaster appointments.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has again expired.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the bill under consideration, H. R. 4155, and known as the veterans' preference bill, continues the law and Executive orders that have been in effect for a number of years providing for veterans' preference in governmental employment. This bill also provides additional features that are of special interest to World War veterans, their wives, and dependents. This legislation includes for the first time, husbands and widowers of service-connected disabled ex-servicewomen.

In addition to continuing the present rules providing for the extension of 5 points for nondisability preference and 10 points disability preference, it gives veterans first priority for positions of guard, elevator operator, messenger, and custodian positions, as far as they can be filled by ex-service men and women. This list could be extended to include a number of additional positions for which servicemen and servicewomen could qualify without difficulty, especially when there are vacancies in such positions.

One of the most important provisions in this bill requires that when an appointing officer passes over a veteran eligible, and selects someone who is not a veteran, then such officer shall file with the Civil Service Commission his reasons for so doing and the veteran shall be entitled to a copy thereof. The veteran also

will have a right to an appeal from this decision.

This measure, as you have been advised, has the approval of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Legion, and the disabled veterans organizations. The bill, as I have suggested at the beginning, strengthens and improves veterans' legislation heretofore passed by Congress.

I believe this legislation will meet with the approval of both Houses of this Congress. In fact, I have heard little objection to it.

Mr. Speaker, I believe there is a consensus of opinion and rightly so, that veterans should be given preference for jobs in industry and business as well as in Government when they are released from the armed forces. Industry and business as well as the Government have assured members of the armed forces they shall have the first right to their former jobs just as far as can be done when the war is over. Our Government should lead the way in the protection of that right.

Mr. Speaker, I think this legislation could go still further and give the veteran a chance to compete for positions that have been filled in any agency of the Government since the emergency was declared, whether that position be in an old-line agency or in what may be described as a war agency. In other words, where a position is continued when the war is over and has been filled by a non-service man or woman, such position shall be open for a veteran who can qualify for such job. I believe this to be fair for the reason that the person now holding such position understood when he or she came into the service that it was for the "duration and 6 months thereafter." If such legislation were enacted, it would give a chance for a good many deserving veterans to compete and qualify for a number of Government positions that may not come under this act. I think the House could very well give favorable consideration to such legislation.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Perhaps I do not understand this legislation correctly. Is this the way it works? If the Government should advertise for an electrical engineer or a certified public accountant, and a number of people took the examination, the top three veterans would get the positions regardless of whether they were electrical engineers or certified public accountants, or whatever the skill was that was required.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The veteran would have to take the competitive examination. He does now. That situation is not changed in this bill.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. But if their marks were only 10 and the highest marks were 90, whoever were the three top veterans would be in line to get the jobs and nudge out the people who were qualified?

Mr. REES of Kansas. No; that is not right, and that is not in the bill.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. That is what I wanted to find out.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The veteran in order to pass has to get a grade of at least 60. Then he gets a 5- or 10-percent preference, as the case may be, added to his grade. Then his name goes to the top of the list with others who have passed the examination, and he competes with others who qualified.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. But if he got 70 percent with his preference, he would knock out a man who got 80 percent; is that right? He could do that?

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is correct; he does go to the top of the list by reason of the preference granted. That is correct.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa, who also takes a deep interest in veterans' legislation.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Is not this very much in line with the veterans-preference laws already on the statute books in many of our States?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Yes; it is. As a matter of fact, it changes the present veterans-preference laws very little in the respect suggested by the gentleman from Illinois [Miss SUMNER].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. This guarantees the soldier a job after the war is over when the soldier returns who has been willing to fight for his country on the fighting front.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is right, as I suggested a few moments ago; I think it is generally understood, and it has been stated on the floor of the House, that veterans ought to have the first chance for jobs when they return from the service. I believe we ought to go one step further, and let the United States Government set the pace in that regard. If the Government does not protect these servicemen with respect to getting jobs, then we are not in very good shape to ask industry and business to give them preference for jobs.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Personally, I think we could go even further than the bill goes in giving these men opportunities for jobs. I think that as to all war jobs that have been created since the beginning of the emergency, if they are retained after the war, servicemen and servicewomen should have a chance for those places if they can qualify for them.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. The gentleman has stated that this bill embarks upon a new principle in that it makes available to a man whose wife has a service-connected disability, a civil-service preference. Is it specifically written in the bill that the husband must be dependent upon the wife for his livelihood in order for him to be eligible for

the preference, or is the fact of marriage sufficient?

Mr. REES of Kansas. The bill provides that husbands of women veterans who have service-connected disabilities shall have the same preference as is accorded wives of men who have service-connected disabilities, and that widowers have the same preference as widows in such cases.

Mr. COLE of New York. But it is the opinion of the gentleman and the opinion of the committee that for a man to qualify for a preference under this bill he must be dependent upon the wife, who likewise must have a service-connected disability?

Mr. REES of Kansas. His wife, an ex-servicewoman with service-connected disability, is the dependent. There is the further provision, that if the husband of an ex-servicewoman is supporting a child of such woman, then he is entitled to preference.

Mr. COLE of New York. He must establish some degree of dependency on the woman veteran?

Mr. REES of Kansas. A dependency must be established.

Mr. COLE of New York. That is, dependency either through himself or by virtue of their children?

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is correct. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LAFOLLETTE] offered the amendment in the committee. I shall yield time to Mr. LAFOLLETTE so he can further explain it.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Yes; I shall be pleased to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am sure we are all for this legislation. I want to ask the gentleman one question. In what degree is greater consideration given to a disabled veteran than to another veteran except the five points additional preference?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Not any in this legislation.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is the whole sum and substance of it?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Yes, so far as the disabled veteran is concerned. Except as I have pointed out, both classes of veterans do have advantages under this bill, but the advantages under this bill are the same.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I understood the disabled veteran would come on the list ahead of the veteran that was not disabled.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Not necessarily.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Not necessarily?

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is right.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is, unless the five points give him that position? Is that right?

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman's statement is correct.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Yes; I shall be glad to yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio, who has also manifested a deep interest in legislation for the benefit of veterans.

Mrs. BOLTON. Did the committee define the real meaning and interpretation of "veteran"? I think all of us are beginning to have a doubt in our minds as to when a man becomes a veteran, because some of them who have been discharged from the Army are being taken back into the Army. Now, when do they become veterans?

Mr. REES of Kansas. The House Committee on Civil Service did not give consideration to that matter. The gentleman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] has called attention to a very important problem, and one to which this House should give consideration in the near future. The situation to which she directs attention should be clarified.

Mrs. BOLTON. It would be very interesting if we did have some definition of that.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I want to ask the gentleman whether it is not now the law that a disabled veteran goes to the top of the list if he passes an examination?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Oh, yes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. And whether that would not be continued under this legislation?

Mr. REES of Kansas. It certainly would. Perhaps I misunderstood the gentleman. What I wanted to explain is that whatever further advantages as are provided under this legislation apply to both classes of servicemen. The advantage of the disabled veteran over the able serviceman under the present law is not changed by this bill.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LAFOLLETTE].

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, I am the sponsor of these two amendments for the benefit of the women who are now serving. You will note in the bill that there are four different categories in which veterans are given preference. The first and the fourth provide equally for men and women. The second, as originally written, provided that the wife of a disabled service-connected veteran should get preference if, because of his disability, he himself could not pass the examination. It seemed to me it was also proper to protect the disabled service-connected woman by permitting her husband, who is supporting her, to get the preference in the same way, because it really runs to the woman. And it is the same with the amendment to subdivision three. This amendment provides that if a disabled, service-connected woman dies then her husband, or whoever was living with her, her widower, who is supporting her children under 18, can then have preference as long as he supports her children. In other words, it runs to the benefit of the woman and the children.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does it not seem manifestly unfair unless we take care of the women and children, because after the war is over it is going to be especially difficult to secure employment?

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. It applies to the women as well as the men.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Yes.

Mr. SPRINGER. I understand in the case of a husband securing a preference, there must be dependency existing?

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Yes. First, his wife must not be able to pass the examination herself because of disability. We do that now for the wife of a disabled service-connected man when she gets a preference if her husband is so badly injured that he cannot pass the examination. Under my amendment to subdivision two, the woman in the service has the same right; if she is terribly disabled, her husband gets a preference, not because it runs to the man, but because it helps to support her.

Mr. SPRINGER. As I understand, too, in case he is supporting her child, that would constitute dependency under the provisions of this act.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. That is right, as long as he supports her children under 18 years of age. Again, that gives this woman some assurance that her children will be taken care of. If she bears children, they are closer to her and if she dies the husband who survives her, as long as he supports her children, gets the preference until they become 18 years of age.

Mr. SPRINGER. I think it is a splendid amendment. I think this is a good bill.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Yes.

Mr. COLE of New York. The gentleman stated that the husband of a woman veteran or any man who might be supporting her children would be eligible for this preference?

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. What I was trying to say is this. Suppose a woman is married and has children and then the father died but the woman married again and then she died; if the man she married the second time continued to support her children until they became 18 years of age, he gets a preference. In other words, the benefit goes to her direct line, from the woman to her children.

Mr. COLE of New York. But it is not necessary to have an established marital status between the man and woman in order that he might get a preference?

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Only that there be children.

Mr. COLE of New York. Is that the only criterion or must there be a marital status?

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. He must be her widower.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Was it the committee's thought that this increased the opportunities for marriage among women who had served in the armed forces?

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. I will say to the gentlewoman from Illinois, to some extent it was my thought that they are entitled to it, and I am sure the gentlewoman from Illinois would be glad to come under it.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Is not the real purpose of the gentleman's amendment to keep the veteran's family intact as much as possible?

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Exactly.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of the time.

I just wish to say a few words with reference to this bill. For several years the Committee on the Civil Service has had legislation of this type pending, but this is the first time the major veterans' organizations have agreed to it. That is the main reason, I would say, why we have not heretofore tried to legislate. It will be noted on page 7 of the report that the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the Disabled American Veterans have agreed on this legislation. Those are the major veterans' organizations.

In addition to that, this legislation has the approval of the Civil Service Commission and it has the approval of the President of the United States. It is true, Mr. Speaker, this act does not make a great many changes in the present veterans' preference, which exists largely by Executive order, but it is important, I think, that those Executive orders be given legislative status by the Congress.

It does give some additional strength to the veterans' preference, by strengthening the Executive orders now in existence. For the first time it includes the husbands and widowers of service-connected disabled women. It also gives absolute preference to veterans in examinations for the position of guard, elevator operator, messenger and custodian, as long as preference eligibles are available. It also gives the right to assign other groups of positions for a period of 5 years, to veterans only; which is a rather important provision in view of the situation that has prevailed. It strengthens the law as to passing over veterans, so that a veteran himself, or his designated representative, may know what the reason is. That is one of the things the veterans themselves have been very much interested in.

I think this is a sane law, and yet it is no more than the men who are fighting for the freedom of our people in this country are entitled to and should have.

I hope there will not be a single vote against this bill.

I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. D'ALESSANDRO].

Mr. D'ALESSANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of H. R. 4115, a bill to give honorably discharged veterans, their widows, and the wives of disabled veterans, who themselves are not qualified, preference in employment where Federal funds are disbursed, and I urge the

passage of this veterans' preference bill, which has the support of the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the Disabled World War Veterans.

At this time I urge the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation to favorably report out H. R. 4057 to the House for action.

I favor this legislation because this Nation of ours has trained 12,000,000 fighting men to destroy and kill. They have been taken away from schools, colleges, and jobs. Their home life has been broken up, and they have turned into hard, tough soldiers and sailors, yes, the best in the world.

Gentlemen, this war will not go on forever. One of these days it will be over; I pray soon.

We will then face a tremendous problem. It will be a problem of returning all these fighting men and women, too, back into normal channels of civilian life. This is a most important problem because it affects 10 percent of our entire population. It is the most vigorous 10 percent of the Nation—the young men and women upon whom the future welfare of this country will depend. Every effort must be made that nothing will interfere with the physical and economic development of this segment of our people.

It is, therefore, a problem that must be solved well, and not in a haphazard, hit-and-miss manner, but must also be solved with understanding and sympathy because it is first of all a great human problem.

Yet the solution will not be easy. As I said previously, these millions of men have been taught how to destroy and kill. Now we have to retrain them how to build and live.

They will be coming back at a time when the country's national economy may be under terrific strain, when millions now employed in war production may be laid off, plants may shut down; no one can accurately predict the shape of those things to come.

But one prediction can be made with certainty. The millions of men and women returning from the war fronts and camps will need jobs, money, training, hospitalization, and other assistance. They will expect stability and security, so that they can start rebuilding their private lives.

We must give them all that. It is the least we can do for them because they will have given us continued freedom and liberty.

All this calls for being ready for a sound and orderly program. It must be a program that is fair alike to veterans and taxpayers. Such a program is needed now because men and women already are being discharged from the armed forces by the thousands every day. This is not only a major post-war program, it is also a today program.

It is my opinion that the American Legion has prepared such a master plan for demobilization and rehabilitation in its omnibus bill for World War No. 2 veterans—their G. I. bill of rights.

If enacted, this bill will provide a sound, modest, constructive plan for

dealing with the entire veteran problem of this war. It will substitute order and system for the chaos and confusion now existing as a dozen different Government agencies are quarreling over control of certain functions for veterans. It will centralize responsibility, reduce red tape, eliminate overlapping services, reduce costs, and, most of all, assure the new veterans of a decent break.

The bill will also prevent a repetition of the tragic mistakes under which World War No. 1 veterans suffered.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield.

Mr. GIFFORD. I attended a committee meeting this morning at which Mr. Green was present. I wanted to ask about veterans preference on a project of the Government, where a union card is necessary. Would the soldier's preference card, even from us, supersede a union card? Could he have the job, or because he did not have a union card would he be refused?

Mr. RAMSPECK. If the gentleman is referring to Government projects, he would be given preference. The Government does not recognize any closed shop agreement, as far as I know. Wherever the Government employs people they have a right to belong to a union, but there is no closed-shop agreement. This bill will give the veterans preference on any jobs where the United States Government, in the executive branch of the Government, is the employer.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. As I understand it, a person now taking a post-office examination, who is going into the service, cannot be considered as eligible for that post office. Does not the gentleman from Georgia feel that that situation should be corrected?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Of course, I am not familiar with the question which the gentleman has asked. I did not know of any such rule existing, but it would not have any effect on this legislation. I will be very glad to look into the question which the gentleman has raised, but it does not affect this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Georgia to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for a division.

The question was taken; and on a division there were—ayes 88, noes none.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that there is no quorum present, and I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—ayes 312, noes 1, not voting 116, as follows:

[Roll No. 54]

YEAS—312

Abernethy	Gilchrist	Mansfield, Tex.
Allen, La.	Gillespie	Marcantonio
Andersen,	Gillette	Martin, Iowa
H. Carl	Gillie	Martin, Mass.
Anderson,	Goodwin	Mason
N. Mex.	Gordon	May
Andresen,	Gossett	Merritt
August H.	Graham	Morrow
Andrews, N. Y.	Grant, Ala.	Michener
Angell	Grant, Ind.	Miller, Conn.
Arends	Gregory	Miller, Mo.
Arnold	Griffiths	Miller, Nebr.
Auchincloss	Gwynne	Miller, Pa.
Barden	Hall,	Mills
Barrett	Edwin Arthur	Monkiewicz
Barry	Hall,	Monroney
Beall	Leonard W.	Mott
Beckworth	Halleck	Mundt
Bell	Hare	Murray, Tenn.
Bennett, Mich.	Harless, Ariz.	Murray, Wis.
Bennett, Mo.	Harness, Ind.	Norman
Bishop	Hartley	O'Brien, Ill.
Blackney	Heffernan	O'Brien, Mich.
Bland	Heldinger	O'Brien, N. Y.
Bloom	Hendricks	O'Hara
Bolton	Herter	O'Konski
Bonner	Hess	O'Toole
Boykin	Hill	Outland
Bradley, Mich.	Hinsshaw	Pace
Brehm	Hobbs	Patman
Brooks	Hoeven	Patton
Brown, Ga.	Hoffman	Peterson, Fla.
Brown, Ohio	Holifield	Peterson, Ga.
Brumbaugh	Holmes, Mass.	Pfeiffer
Bryson	Holmes, Wash.	Philbin
Bulwinkle	Hope	Pittenger
Burch, Va.	Howell	Pleeser
Burchill, N. Y.	Hull	Plumley
Burgin	Izac	Poage
Busbey	Jackson	Poulsen
Byrne	Jeffrey	Powers
Camp	Jennings	Pracht,
Canfield	Johnson,	C. Frederick
Capozzoli	Anton J.	Pratt,
Carlson, Kans.	Johnson,	Joseph M.
Carrier	Calvin D.	Priest
Celler	Johnson, Ind.	Rabaut
Church	Johnson,	Ramey
Clason	J. Leroy	Ramspeck
Cochran	Johnson,	Randolph
Cole, Mo.	Luther A.	Rankin
Cole, N. Y.	Johnson,	Reece, Tenn.
Colmer	Lyndon B.	Reed, Ill.
Compton	Johnson, Ward	Rees, Kans.
Cooper	Jonkman	Richards
Costello	Judd	Robertson
Courtney	Kean	Robinson, Utah
Cox	Kearney	Robson, Ky.
Cravens	Keefe	Rockwell
Crawford	Kelley	Rodgers, Pa.
Crosser	Keogh	Rogers, Calif.
Cunningham	Kilburn	Rogers, Mass.
Curley	Kilday	Rohrbough
Curtis	King	Rowan
D'Alesandro	Kinzer	Rowe
Davis	Kirwan	Sabath
Dawson	Kieberg	Satterfield
Day	Klein	Scanlon
Deaney	Knutson	Schiffner
Dewey	LaFollette	Scott
Dickstein	Lambertson	Servner
Dilweg	Lanham	Short
Dingell	Larcade	Simpson, Pa.
Dondero	Lea	Smith, Maine
Doughton	LeCompte	Smith, Ohio
Dworshak	Lemke	Smith, Wis.
Eaton	Lesirski	Snyder
Elliott	Lewis	Spence
Ellis	Luce	Springer
Ellison, Md.	Ludlow	Starnes, Ala.
Ellsworth	Lynch	Stearns, N. H.
Elmer	McConnell	Stevenson
Elston, Ohio	McCord	Stigler
Engel, Mich.	McCormack	Stockman
Feighan	McCowan	Sullivan
Fish	McGehee	Sumner, Ill.
Fisher	McGregor	Summers, Tex.
Fitzpatrick	McKenzie	Sundstrom
Flannagan	McLean	Taber
Folger	McMillan	Talbot
Forand	McMurray	Talle
Gallagher	Madden	Tarver
Gamble	Magnuson	Taylor
Gathings	Mahon	Thomas, N. J.
Gavin	Maloney	Thomas, Tex.
Gibson	Mansfield,	Thomason
Gifford	Mont.	Tibbott

Tolan	Wasielewski	Winstead
Torrens	Weaver	Winter
Towe	Welch	Wolfcott
Treadway	Wene	Wolfenden, Pa.
Troutman	West	Wolverton, N. J.
Vincent, Ky.	Whichel, Ga.	Woodruff, Mich.
Vinson, Ga.	Whitten	Woodrum, Va.
Voorhis, Calif.	Whittington	Worley
Vorys, Ohio	Wickersham	Wright
Vursell	Wigglesworth	Zimmerman
Wadsworth	Willey	
Walter	Wilson	

NAYS—1

Smith, Va.

NOT VOTING—116

Allen, Ill.	Ford	Morrison, La.
Anderson, Calif.	Fulbright	Morrison, N. C.
Andrews, Ala.	Fuller	Mruk
Baldwin, Md.	Fulmer	Murdock
Baldwin, N. Y.	Furlong	Murphy
Bates, Ky.	Gale	Myers
Bates, Mass.	Gearhart	Newsome
Bender	Gerlach	Norrell
Boren	Gore	Norton
Bradley, Pa.	Gorski	O'Connor
Buckley	Granger	O'Neal
Buffett	Green	Phillips
Burdick	Gross	Price
Butler	Hagen	Reed, N. Y.
Cannon, Fla.	Hale	Rivers
Cannon, Mo.	Hancock	Rizley
Carson, Ohio	Harris, Ark.	Rolph
Carter	Harris, Va.	Russell
Case	Hart	Sadowski
Chapman	Hays	Sasser
Chenoweth	Hébert	Sauthoff
Chilperfield	Hoch	Schwabe
Clark	Horan	Shafer
Clevenger	Jarman	Sheppard
Coffee	Jenkins	Sheridan
Cooley	Jensen	Sikes
Dies	Johnson, Okla.	Simpson, Ill.
Dirksen	Jones	Slaughter
Disney	Kee	Smith, W. Va.
Douglas	Kefauver	Somers, N. Y.
Drewry	Kennedy	Sparkman
Durham	Kerr	Stanley
Eberharter	Kunkel	Stefan
Engle, Calif.	Landis	Stewart
Fay	Lane	Ward
Fellows	LeFevre	Welch, Ohio
Fenton	McWilliams	Weiss
Fernandez	Maas	White
Fogarty	Manasco	

So, two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended, and the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs:

Mr. Green, with Mr. Jenkins.
 Mr. Hart, with Mr. Reed of New York.
 Mr. O'Neal, with Mr. Dirksen.
 Mr. Hoch, with Mr. Kunkel.
 Mr. Buckley, with Mr. Jones.
 Mr. Sparkman, with Mr. Douglas.
 Mr. Lane, with Mr. Schwabe.
 Mr. Manasco, with Mr. Welch of Ohio.
 Mr. Fay, with Mr. Shafer.
 Mr. Gorski, with Mr. LeFevre.
 Mr. Sadowski, with Mr. Stefan.
 Mr. Engle of California, with Mr. Chenoweth.
 Mr. Ward, with Mr. Simpson of Illinois.
 Mr. Boykin, with Mr. Rolph.
 Mrs. Norton, with Miss Stanley.
 Mr. Sheppard, with Mr. Fenton.
 Mr. Kennedy, with Mr. Allen of Illinois.
 Mr. Andrews of Alabama, with Mr. Butler.
 Mr. Somers of New York, with Mr. Carson of Ohio.
 Mr. Morrison of Louisiana, with Mr. Jensen.
 Mr. Furlong, with Mr. Clevenger.
 Mr. Murdock, with Mr. Baldwin of New York.
 Mr. Chapman, with Mr. Sauthoff.
 Mr. Fulbright, with Mr. Rizley.
 Mr. Newsome, with Mr. Phillips.
 Mr. Slaughter, with Mr. Anderson of California.
 Mr. Baldwin of Maryland, with Mr. Fuller.
 Mr. Bradley of Pennsylvania, with Mr. Landis.

Mr. Cannon of Missouri, with Mr. Fellows.
 Mr. Drewry, with Mr. Horan.
 Mr. Harris of Virginia, with Mr. Buffett.
 Mr. Jarman, with Mr. Hancock.
 Mr. Weiss, with Mr. Bender.
 Mr. Smith of West Virginia, with Mr. Gross.
 Mr. Kerr, with Mr. Maas.
 Mr. Kee, with Mr. Mruk.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD ACADEMY

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

APRIL 12, 1944.

The SPEAKER,

House of Representatives,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN, of Alabama, has resigned from the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy, and I am writing to advise you that I have appointed Hon. LOUIS J. CAPOZZOLI, of New York, to serve in his place.

Yours very sincerely,

S. O. BLAND, Chairman.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article by Gould Lincoln entitled "Sphinx of Albany, Tom Dewey."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably delayed attending a session of the House on last Friday. Had I been present I would have voted for the naval appropriation bill.

EXTENSION OF LEND-LEASE

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 498, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4254), to extend for 1 year the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, as amended, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 days, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as or-

dered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH], to be used as he deems proper, and I yield myself 5 minutes at this time.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order the consideration of the bill H. R. 4254, reported by the Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 4254, with the exception of one amendment, simply provides for an extension of the Lend-Lease Act adopted in 1941 for the period of 1 year.

At the hearing before the Rules Committee on the application for a rule it was disclosed that this bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Foreign Affairs. The action of the Rules Committee on the pending resolution was unanimous. A splendid report was filed with the bill. It sets forth convincing reasons why the bill should be accepted. If there is doubt in the minds of Members, I would suggest that they obtain a copy of the report from the Clerk's desk. It is brief and informative and would be helpful to you in getting a clear picture of what has been done in administering the Lend-Lease Act.

I notice that the report refers to lend-lease as an essential part of our organization for waging war. I get some degree of satisfaction out of that declaration made by the committee.

Continuing, the report reads as follows:

Lend-lease has been built into the fabric of the supply arrangements of the United Nations and has been approved, over and over again, a flexible and valuable part of our mobilization for war, serving the needs of our many battle fronts in ways which contribute to the development of sound and harmonious relations with our allies. So long as the war continues—and it is the duty of every civilian officer of the Government, as Mr. Stettinius pointed out, "to work, think, and plan for war until the shooting stops"—the Lend-Lease Act is a military necessity of the first importance.

Mr. Speaker, there are those who will recall that in 1941, when this lend-lease proposal reached the House, I referred to it as an act of war. That statement was rather shocking to some because the country had been educated into the belief that it was a movement in behalf of peace. I think it was along about that time I stated publicly that I regarded both the destroyer transaction and the lend-lease proposal as acts of war. I could not see that they were efforts to maintain peace. We were unprepared for a war that we could not escape. We needed time to prepare. In this report they now acknowledge lend-lease to have been an act of war. There was no disposition, however, on my part to quarrel with those in charge of public affairs and who were insisting that the lend-lease and destroyer transactions were moves on the part of the Government in behalf of peace.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Some, having much to do with the advancement of these proposals, probably realized that they were in fact acts of war, but because of public sentiment were unable to take that position. Very frankly, I think the President traveled in the direction of war just as rapidly as he could safely afford to without so shocking public sentiment as to get a reaction which would operate as a depressant upon the preparations for war that were then necessarily going on, and of what he has done in waging war I have nothing but praise.

Mr. Speaker, the committee reporting this bill offers an amendment. As to what the House should do with it I make no suggestion. It simply imposes something of a limitation upon the power of the President which the original may have carried. As for myself, I see no objection to the amendment. As a matter of fact, it is my disposition to give it my support, although I have the feeling that there are those who think it ill-advised and will insist that it not be carried in the bill if and when it is finally passed by this House.

I hardly feel that it is necessary to discuss this matter. I am convinced that all Members of Congress realize the importance of the extension of this act and have knowledge of the part it has played in the waging of the war we are now carrying on in all parts of the world. I hope it is adopted without a dissenting vote.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has again expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this bill extends for 1 year the provisions of the Lend-Lease Act which was approved March 11, 1941. It comes to you with the unanimous endorsement of the Committee on Rules.

I believe that in the long time I have been a Member of the Congress and of the House of Representatives we had the most extended and controversial debate on the passage of the original lend-lease legislation. I remember very well that the gentleman from Georgia—and I think he was the only Member of the House to do so—stated at that time that the lend-lease bill was actually an act of war. I further remember complimenting the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] on his intellectual honesty in making that statement, because those of us who opposed the original lend-lease bill always stated that it was a step toward war and those who advocated it said, not all, it was aimed to keep us out of war, and was an act short of war. I spoke repeatedly upon the bill and always said that I opposed it because I felt it was a step to get us into war. Now it is virtually admitted, although it may be an academic question that it was an act of war at that time, as the gentleman from Georgia said. The public did not know it back home or the bill would not have gone through, because the public were not for war.

I remember now—and I have not looked over the bill—one provision in that bill. I am not discussing the question of the merits or demerits of the provision, I am merely pointing out that

that provision was an act of war in itself. It provided for the reequipping and rebuilding of belligerent battleships and warships of all kinds, a complete repudiation of all international law and of the traditional policy of America laid down by the Alabama Claims case some 70 years ago, and subscribed to by every civilized nation.

There were other parts of that bill also that were acts of war, but the majority leader and everybody else supporting the bill told us it was a measure short of war and that it had for its purpose keeping us out of war. Now we find 3 years later quite to the contrary.

It is not only the gentleman from Georgia who makes such a statement. I have here a similar statement from a distinguished American, Arthur Hays Sulzberger, editor and I believe owner of the New York Times, one of the greatest newspapers in America if not in the world. Speaking a short time ago before some Red Cross gathering, he had this to say:

I happen to be one of those who believe that we did not go to war because we were attacked at Pearl Harbor. I hold rather that we were attacked at Pearl Harbor because we had gone to war when we had made the lend-lease declaration.

That statement has been carried in all the newspapers of the country. I admire his honesty just as much as I admire the intellectual honesty of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox].

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I wish to make the observation that I agree with the gentleman that Pearl Harbor or no Pearl Harbor, we were in the war. I think we were in the grip of forces over which we had no control. It was because of the feeling that we were being drawn into the war and without the possibility of helping ourselves that I supported lend-lease and the destroyer transaction.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me at that point?

Mr. FISH. I certainly am glad to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WRIGHT. I am inclined to agree with the gentleman from Georgia, but I am afraid I have to disagree with the gentleman from New York. I believe there was a sincere effort made, at the time the Lend-Lease Act was passed, to keep us out of war, but I do believe that the inevitable drift of circumstances at that time, which, of course, many of us did not foresee, carried us into war. I do believe that unless we had passed the Lend-Lease Act we would have fought the war, but we would not have had any allies.

Mr. FISH. I am not going to argue as to the merits or demerits of lend-lease as that is today more or less an academic question. I think 80 percent of the American people were very desirous of keeping out of the war until we were attacked at Pearl Harbor. I confess that

even after the passage of the Lend-Lease Act I had some hopes we would keep out of this European or world war, which has become a global war since we have entered it. I think most American people hoped that also. But actually, when we passed the original lend-lease bill, according to some of its supporters, they believed we entered the war then and that it was an act of war. I want this question as a matter of historical data to be discussed now and placed in the RECORD. Of course, I have no apologies for my views. I would have done anything in the world to keep out of the war. I do not agree with those who say we would have been involved in this war anyway. The American people were almost united in their determination to stay out of war until or unless we were attacked by Japan or any other nation. After we were attacked in that dastardly and lawless manner at Pearl Harbor the whole Nation was unified, interventionists and noninterventionists alike, and all but one Member of Congress voted for war. All Members of Congress, Republicans and Democrats alike, since then have voted for every appropriation to win the war. We all are united and determined, no matter what it costs in blood, money, and tears, to win the war. I am going back to the time we first passed the lend-lease bill, and I am placing in the RECORD statements made by its supporters who now claim it was an act of war when the entire American public and the Congress were told by the proponents of the measure that it was a peace measure to keep us out of the war and who were always saying it was a measure short of war. Now we find, long afterward, that that was not the fact.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. WRIGHT. I would not quarrel with any individual's position prior to Pearl Harbor. I am convinced there was a difference of opinion; in most cases it was an honest difference of opinion. The only quarrel I have with the gentleman from New York is the implication in his remarks that if we did not pass the lend-lease bill we would not have been involved in the war. I maintain we would have been involved in the war, but we would not have had any allies to fight the war with.

Mr. FISH. That is one thing neither I nor the gentleman from Pennsylvania can possibly prove. You are entitled to your views and I am entitled to mine. If we had actually entered the war at the time of the passage of the Lend-Lease Act, it would have been disastrous, as Germany would never have attacked Soviet Russia and we would have held the war bag. I believe that the lend-lease bill and the measures that followed it were all direct steps to war. But today it is not the noninterventionists who were opposed to these measures who are saying it, but those who advocated the lend-lease and other measures who are now saying that the lend-lease virtually was an act of war. And it is not our side, I mean the noninterventionist side, that makes that contention, but it is the proponents of the bill, who were always say-

ing this was a measure short of war and to keep us out of the war, and that it was for America's interest primarily to keep us out of this conflict.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. WRIGHT. I venture to say that if the gentleman would consult the ideas of Members of Congress who were here when the Lend-Lease Act was passed, that at the time, with the exception of the gentleman from Georgia who was quite frank, and I remember his statement that it was an act of war, most, if not all of the gentlemen beside him were convinced that we might be able to avoid war in that way by bolstering up our allies.

Mr. FISH. I think they made it very clear so far as the public is concerned, in voting for it they voted for it as a peace measure and not a war measure. Many of us, not on this side alone, because it was nonpartisan to that extent, said this is a step toward war and that this would involve us in war. That is why we were opposing it because we wanted to keep out of war. Mind you, we were not opposed to helping England. We were not opposed to giving supplies and arms to England because as I recall now, as I am speaking, I made the motion to recommit, to give \$2,000,000,000 to England to buy supplies and weapons in this country in order to protect herself in her hour of need. As a matter of record England did not use under this bill the \$2,000,000,000 during the first year. So my proposal, which was voted upon in the motion to recommit on a record vote, was to make that \$2,000,000,000 available immediately, showing we wanted to help England, but did not want to get into war by doing so. We knew that if we equipped and repaired belligerent battleships that it was in itself an act of war and a repudiation of every principle of international law and our own American traditions.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. SABATH. Does not the gentleman contend that the passage of the Lend-Lease Act was an act of war and that it forced us into the war and that if we had not passed it we would not have been involved in this war?

Mr. FISH. My contention was that it was one of many steps which involved us in the war, which is now admitted by many of its proponents. Those of us who felt differently but wanted to aid England by measures short of war, which was our position, and which at one time was the position of both parties, offered this amendment for \$2,000,000,000, so England could buy all the supplies, ammunition, foodstuffs, and everything else in this country during that year and if she needed more the next year we were willing to make additional appropriations, but we did not want to be involved in the war, which these and other provisions in the bill actually did accomplish.

Mr. SABATH. What I want to know is whether the gentleman contends that

the passage of the lend-lease bill brought us into war?

Mr. FISH. I am contending just as my language indicates, which I think is very clear, that this was one of the steps that led toward war. The proponents of the bill, including Mr. Sulzberger, say now it was actually an act of war.

Mr. Speaker, I would like now to take some time to discuss a bill which went through unanimously under the very able leadership of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Bloom], who today put through by unanimous consent a bill of which I was the author, to feed the starving women and children in the occupied democratic countries of Europe. That bill having gone through by unanimous consent, I think it is proper there should be some discussion of it at the present time. Time is of the essence. It will do no good, it will be a mere gesture, a mere scrap of paper, if we just pass this resolution and do nothing more about it. I take it it is the unanimous purpose of the House of Representatives and of the Congress of the United States, because the Senate has passed a similar bill, to use our influence and use it now, a great moral influence, to try to persuade our friends and allies, the British, to relax the blockade so that millions of little starving children in France, Belgium, Holland, Norway, Poland, and other democratic nations can be saved from starvation. Unless we act, and unless our Government acts, carrying out the desires and the will of the Congress and the elected Representatives of the people, urging the British to relax this blockade, millions of small, innocent, helpless children in Europe will die of starvation during the coming winter, if the war lasts that long, because it must be self-evident that there will be not enough food to go around in these occupied democracies during the coming winter. They are on the verge of starvation now. Many of them have already died of starvation and dread diseases such as rickets. Sixty-five percent of them have some form of incipient tuberculosis.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. FISH. I will yield myself 5 additional minutes.

We, in America, are indeed fortunate. We have plenty to eat. We have been so far saved from air raids and bombings by the enemy but these mothers and children in the nations that have been overrun by the Germans are the victims of war and its ravages. They did not cause the war. They had nothing to do with the war whatever. Their fathers fought against the Germans until they were defeated and their countries overrun. Today, as a matter of record, we are feeding our own prisoners in Germany. Great Britain, who so far has refused to relax the blockade, is also feeding hers in Germany, and let me say in all fairness, the English people feel exactly the way we do, and Parliament feels the same way, and I predict that within a short time the blockade will be relaxed and these occupied nations with their own money, because they have gold

and other securities in the United States and England, will be able to buy food and milk and vitamins to send in Swedish ships, neutral ships, to France, Holland, Belgium, Norway, Poland, and other occupied countries, including Finland if advisable.

I believe the British have already about made up their minds, or are going to make up their minds shortly, and this resolution will be very helpful, showing the will of the Congress and of the American people, in favor of relaxing the blockade. We can understand perfectly well that in the first part of the war, when England was under attack, she could not afford to relax the blockade. Conditions are different today, and England is not in any immediate danger of attack. During the last war Herbert Hoover was the administrator of relief in Belgium for 4 long years. He fed 7,000,000 Belgians and kept them alive. It is claimed that not 1 pound of this food went to the German Army or to the German population. Today we are sending to Greece great quantities of food. Turkey and Canada are doing likewise. We are sending it in Swedish ships and keeping the young children and mothers of Greece alive, where a short time ago they were on the verge of starvation and death. It has worked well wherever it has been tried. I know of no military reason for not permitting those occupied countries to buy food, or even for us to put up the money to buy food and let them buy it elsewhere, in Argentina or South Africa, or wherever food may be had. But we have a great moral responsibility in America. We cannot simply sit quietly and wash our hands like Pontius Pilate, and let millions of innocent children die in the agony of starvation, with bloated stomachs, or die from some dread disease while we evade the issue and evade the moral responsibility as one of the partners in a war, with food abundant to save these unfortunate and helpless from death or from living with twisted and distorted bodies and minds.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Why not ask former President Hoover to feed the hungry children again? He did a good job at that time.

Mr. FISH. I think he could do just as good a job today as he did before. But one thing I want to make abundantly clear is that if 1 pound of this food goes to the German Army or goes to the German population, then we should stop it immediately. If they did take all of it, nothing would be lost, as it would not be enough to last 24 hours. At least we would have made an honest effort. At least we would have carried out the desire of the American people to help those starving children and to try to save them from death by starvation and disease.

I predict that unless something is done immediately there will be mass starvation, and millions of these helpless children—Jews and Gentiles—will die that terrible death of hunger within the next 6 months. It would be the greatest tragedy of the war, and we would be morally

responsible unless we make a sincere and honest effort to persuade the British Government to relax the blockade and permit us to ship the much-needed food to the occupied nations. So I am hoping that not only this Congress will be listened to by No. 10 Downing Street, but I hope that the women of America, who are primarily interested in this kind of humanitarian relief legislation, will write to the Secretary of State and to the President and ask them to use their influence in accordance with the unanimous request of the Congress of the United States, to start feeding these children before it is too late. Even now millions of European children will be crippled for life, and if food is not forthcoming soon, the future destiny of these occupied nations will be ghastly beyond words.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, to my mind it is unthinkable that this bill should not pass. I believe it will pass unanimously. To stop lend-lease at this stage of the war would be a tragedy.

There is one amendment, however, that I plan to introduce, which I feel is very important. Under the master agreement, article V, the Government of the United States—this is the agreement with Russia:

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics will return to the United States of America at the end of the present emergency, as determined by the President of the United States of America, such defense articles transferred by this agreement, as shall not have been destroyed, lost, or consumed, as shall be determined by the President to be useful in the defense of the United States of America or the Western Hemisphere, or to be otherwise of use to the United States of America.

Under the terms of the act, the President, for the Government, has the power to bring back supplies to this country, or to dispose of them in the country where there is a concentration of supplies or some supplies, or transfer them to some other country or countries. My amendment would provide that, before disposition of such concentrated supplies shall be made by the President, the Congress must approve it.

It is a vital amendment for the protection of the United States. I remember the time when the United States was shipping supplies to Japan over my protests—scrap iron, cotton, and copper; supplies that were used against us and are still being used against us. Nobody knows what the future will bring forth. Nobody knows whether these countries who are now our allies will be our allies after the war is finished. We hope that they will be with us and that it will be possible for us to be with them, but nobody knows. I want to make sure that before final disposition is made of thousands and thousands of airplanes and thousands and thousands of tanks and other material of war, the Congress shall have some say in that final disposition.

Mr. Speaker, I have recently talked with a great many men, a great many wounded men and veterans who have been fighting in the South Pacific and fighting in the Atlantic. It is the wish of the men with whom I have talked that the Congress should have some decision in the final disposition of the materials of war.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself one-half minute.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I just want to call the attention of the House to the fact that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mrs. LUCE] wrote a very able letter on the feeding of women and children of occupied democracies which appears in today's issue of the Herald Tribune. She has also incorporated it in the RECORD. I believe it is worth reading by all those who are interested in the details of feeding these children.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4254) to extend for 1 year the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, as amended.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4254, with Mr. MAGNUSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to take up much time in explaining this bill (H. R. 4254) because it is very brief. We have gone over the lend-lease legislation twice before. This is the third time. The Committee on Foreign Affairs has held very lengthy hearings on the extension of this act.

May I say that the legislation now under consideration extends the Lend-Lease Act for 1 year. It is just the same as the previous renewal legislation that we have passed, with one exception. On page 2 of the bill a new section has been added, as follows:

SEC. 2. Subsection (b) of section 3 is amended by striking out the period after the word "satisfactory" and inserting the following: "Provided, however, That nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to authorize the President in any final settlement to assume or incur any obligations on the part of the United States with respect to post-war economic or post-war military policy except in accordance with established constitutional procedure."

That section, Mr. Chairman, was offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] and accepted by the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Its object is to perfect the legislation, if it

needs perfection, with reference to post-war conditions. Outside of that the legislation remains the same except for the fact it is extended for 1 year from July 1, 1944.

Lend-lease is a major weapon for victory.

On the battle fronts all over the world lend-lease has demonstrated its value.

Lend-lease has put guns and planes and other munitions into the hands of our gallant Russian, British, Chinese, and other allies. This investment in our national security and in the joint security with our allies has produced victories and has saved the lives of many American boys as well as those of our allies. In the great offensives to come, it will prove its worth even more fully.

The forces of each of the United Nations have been equipped principally from its own war industries. But the forces of each have been strengthened by supplies and services received from its allies. This joining of men and materials is enabling the United Nations to strike harder blows against the Axis on every battle front—in the air over Europe, on the plains of Poland and Rumania, in the mountains of Italy, in the islands and on the sea of the South and Southwest Pacific, in the jungles of Burma, and in the air over China.

Through lend-lease we have helped to equip the men of our allies fighting shoulder to shoulder with our men on these battlefields. To each of these battle fronts we have sent under lend-lease thousands of planes, tanks, and guns. And to the arsenals of our allies behind these battle fronts we have sent quantities of war-production supplies to help increase the amount of munitions they turn out and food to nourish the war workers turning them out.

In return our forces stationed abroad receive as reverse lend-lease from our allies all of the supplies and services that can be locally procured. Our forces in the South and Southwest Pacific theaters, for example, receive as reverse lend-lease 90 percent of the food they eat. Even Britain, with an area smaller than New England, supplies without payment by us 20 percent of the food consumed by our forces in the British Isles. And French North and West Africa are producing quantities of food that are turned over without cost to our troops in the Mediterranean theater. Each of our allies, no matter what may be the size of its contribution to us in the form of reverse lend-lease, is putting everything it has into winning the war.

The cost of the lend-lease program up to January 1, 1944, amounted to slightly less than \$20,000,000,000. That is a lot of money. But it is less than we are presently spending in 3 months to win this war. The costs of this war are high in any terms. But the costs to this country in the blood of our men and the tears of their mothers, as well as in dollars, would have been immeasurably greater if we had been forced to fight this war alone or without some of our fighting allies.

The armed forces of the United Nations are poised both in Europe and the

Far East for new and greater offensives soon to come. The supply plans for these offensives are based on the solid foundation of each of the United Nations helping each other through lend-lease and reverse lend-lease. Only if we supply the Soviet Union with more planes, guns, steel, and food can she strike with fullest effect more mighty blows from the east while we strike from other sides. Only with an ever-increasing volume of aid can China become the great land base from which we can hit at the heart of Japan. Only if we continue to help arm the airmen, the soldiers, and the sailors of Britain can they play their full part by our side in the invasions to come.

On two great principles—the efficient pooling of material resource, made possible by lend-lease and reverse lend-lease and the free interchange of fighting manpower made possible by unity of command—rest our entire plans for fighting this war to final victory. The flexible, strategic use of fighting men and fighting resources wherever they are most needed and can do most to achieve victory is the key to our war operations.

Any change in these great and proven principles at this stage of the war is unthinkable. Not to extend the Lend-Lease Act would be to call off an important—and successful—part of the war. No one who has the best interests of American security and of our brave fighting men at heart would possibly vision that. This House will, I am sure, overwhelmingly endorse again the wisdom and forethought it showed in enacting and extending lend-lease as one of the outstanding bulwarks of our security.

We are at a critical hour in the history of this great country. We are on the eve of new and greater offensives. When our heroic men go into the battles to come they will be shoulder to shoulder with our brave allies. They will be part of a United Nations fighting team which has been strengthened through lend-lease and reverse lend-lease. We shall reach final victory sooner, and with less loss in the treasure of our manhood, because we have learned to work and fight together with other free and brave peoples.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the courtesy extended me by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON]. Perhaps the members of the committee will indulge me for a moment in a discussion of a certain amendment proposed by the Committee on Foreign Affairs to the so-called Lend-Lease Act, which will be found on page 2 of the bill. It relates to section 2 of subsection (b) of section 3 of the act. It is that subsection which confers upon the President the power to make what are called the final settlements of lend-lease agreements.

In view of the potential importance of those settlements the committee believed it might be well to propose an amendment and urge its adoption which would make it clear beyond all doubt that the President of the United States in making final settlements with one of our allies,

for example, at the termination of hostilities, should not commit the United States in any manner with respect to future economic post-war policies or post-war military policies. It is for that reason that this language has been proposed as a proviso to be added to subsection (b) to which I have already referred.

Provided, however, That nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to authorize the President in any final settlement to assume or incur any obligations on the part of the United States with respect to post-war economic or post-war military policy except in accordance with established constitutional procedure.

From time to time there has been a good deal of discussion among Members of the House and other people with respect to just how far the President of the United States might commit the Government of the United States in the future in the making of the so-called final settlements with one of our allies. Some people have expressed the fear, I may say, that in the making of those settlements, which really have to do with goods and supplies, the President might enter into some sort of an agreement with another government or nation which would have an effect upon the future policy of the United States, in trade relations, for example, facilities for air transportation internationally, a semimilitary alliance, and so forth. One might conjure up a number of fields of future policy which under a strained interpretation of the law as it now stands, and I use that language advisedly, to which the President might commit the country. Hence, your Committee on Foreign Affairs, seeking to clarify that situation, proposed this amendment.

While we are talking about final settlements, perhaps the members of the committee will indulge me further, because a little further discussion as to their nature is necessary in order to more accurately measure the meaning and the significance of the amendment proposed by the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Of course, no one of us can tell when the war will end, and I always hesitate in indulging in too much of visionary thinking as we attempt to solve in advance some of the problems that will confront us when the war is over. The lend-lease program, which I am convinced has become an extraordinarily effective military weapon, has great ramifications. For example, to state it briefly, if you examine the extent of the lend-lease operations in Russia, if you will examine our report and the hearings and the testimony taken in those hearings, you will note that under the lend-lease program we have sent to Russia over 8,000 airplanes. They are all combat planes. They are flown by Russian fliers against the Germans. We have sent to Russia 170,000 trucks, all for use by the Russian army in carting supplies over ever-lengthening lines of communication, as the Russians advance westward driving the Germans out of their own country and approaching the borders of Germany itself.

In addition, according to my best recollection, something like 30,000 other motor vehicles of one type or another,

and used by the Russian Army, have been contributed to Russia under this program.

Let us try to visualize the end of the war, and remember, as we do so, under the Lend-Lease Act the title to all of that property remains in the United States. We have not given it away. We have loaned its use without charge. Whatever there is left of it at the conclusion of the war, whether it be in Russia or Britain or Australia or New Zealand, or wherever, all of it that is left is the property of the United States. Of course, the problem will then arise—and we all hope it will be approached by sensible and practical people—of appraising the value of the property that is left.

And probably we will find at the end of hostilities that a very large number of trucks and other motor vehicles sent to Russia have been literally worn out and would have very little more than a scrap-iron value. Others would be partially worn out. You can all visualize the condition of that motor equipment after serving for months and months in the mud and snows of one campaign after another. Some of it at the end of the war may be quite usable and well worth salvaging for the use of the United States itself. Some one will have to decide, and undoubtedly it will be done by the military people on the ground, what the United States will do with its property. Of course, that decision will involve really a study of the salvag value of all this material.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Is it not a fact that a great deal of that property might be credited against the commitment of this Government under the U. N. R. R. A. program of \$1,360,000,000, and those nations will give us credit for that material and leave it in Europe? It would not pay to bring it back to the United States.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is possible, of course, although the U. N. R. R. A. program is completely separate and distinct from lend-lease.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ROWE. That arrangement will be dependent upon those charged with the responsibility of U. N. R. R. A. rather than lend-lease, would it not?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I would say jointly. That is a possibility. We cannot stand here this afternoon and say what we are going to do with 10 jeeps that are found in Liberia half worn out when this war is over. Our military people are the people who are responsible for the delivery of all this equipment to our allies. None of it has been sent to our allies except on the recommendation and the request of our own military high command, centering up to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, after emanating from such distinguished men as General MacArthur, General Eisenhower, and Admiral Nimitz or whatever high command of the American military is in existence.

Of course, the time will come eventually—and it would be splendid if it came next month—when this salvaging operation will have to be embarked upon. As I visualize it, and I am speaking only my own opinion, it will be done almost entirely by our military people on the ground, serving with our own forces, and with the French and with the Russians and with the British, as the case may be, and who will be in a position to say whether or not that particular truck is worth sending back to the United States, or would it be better to send it to another theater of war, against Japan, for example, if Japan is still in the war, or would it be so far worn out that it would not be worth our trying to use it again, and therefore it might be sold for what it will fetch like an old used automobile, with which we are all so familiar.

That same problem will come along with airplanes. Of course, the wastage in airplanes is terrific. They wear out very fast. All sorts of injuries and damages are inflicted upon planes in addition to losses in battle. When the end comes it is inevitable that in one country or another we will have a lot of planes. Again, it will be a salvage problem that the military people, I think, will be competent to settle.

The law says, of course, that this final settlement shall be made by the President, but I cannot visualize any President of the United States informing himself in detail with respect to thousands and thousands of items scattered over the face of the earth. Of necessity, whoever is President will have to delegate that function to men who know something of the value of the equipment that is left over.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WRIGHT. Does not the gentleman think that the salvage of property is further complicated by the fact that we have to be rather careful about glutting our own markets with some of this war equipment and keeping our industries from turning out new equipment and thus keeping our industries from employing the men coming back?

Mr. WADSWORTH. There are various complications of the sort mentioned by the gentleman, all of which have to be taken into consideration.

Perhaps I am anticipating the discussion that may arise here concerning an amendment which may be offered to the effect that the basic act shall be amended so as to bring back to the Congress of the United States the job of making those final settlements. For the life of me, Mr. Chairman, I cannot see how the Congress can ever do it. It would just be impossible for any committee or combination of committees of the Congress to sit down here in Washington and appraise the value of half worn-out trucks in Egypt or India or Burma, if you please, or Russia.

It might soothe our pride a little bit if we insist that we do it, but I know we could not do it. We just could not. From a practical standpoint, it is im-

possible. In my judgment, it would take us years to do it. Under the law it is left to the President, and as I said a moment ago, I do not suspect for one moment that the President will be the man to do it. It will be the man in the field. We have to trust to that man's sound common sense to protect the interests of the United States, remembering always that all of this property belongs to us and does not belong to Great Britain or Russia or the French Committee of Liberation or Australia or New Zealand. It all belongs to us.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WRIGHT. The property belongs to us wherever it may be?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Wherever it may be.

Mr. WRIGHT. If it is transferred from one country to another, it still belongs to us?

Mr. WADSWORTH. It always does. We never lose title. We have merely loaned the use of the material.

Mr. ELMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ELMER. If it belongs to us, what becomes of the report of the Senators who were over there that the English and the Russians had traded a lot of it off to other countries? How are we going to get it back then?

Mr. WADSWORTH. We found that that is not true.

Mr. ELMER. That is reported by the Senators to be true.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am glad to say that the Committee on Foreign Affairs has found that that is not true.

Mr. ELMER. It is generally believed.

Mr. WADSWORTH. None of our property has been traded away, none of it.

Mr. ELMER. Where is the proof? Has the gentleman proof of this?

Mr. WADSWORTH. In the testimony in the hearings. That was inquired into last year and it was inquired into again this year.

Mr. ELMER. The gentleman heard the statement of that Russian up here a short time ago that it was being traded on by Russia. Another thing is that we are shipping lend-lease now, are we not, from the western coast of the United States in Russian ships through the Japanese lines, landing on the east coast of Russia? Who gets that material? Where is it going?

Mr. WADSWORTH. As far as I know—and there are other members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs present—no such statement has ever been made to us about that traffic. I am not in a position to answer every rumor that comes up.

Mr. ELMER. Some Members of this House know that Russian ships are carrying goods from the United States through the Japanese lines and landing them on the east coast of Russia. Does the gentleman believe they are shipping that material 8,000 miles, over to the

German front, or are they trading it to the Japs?

Mr. BLOOM. They are not trading anything.

Mr. ELMER. That is what the gentleman says, but the indications are that they are trading it to the Japs.

Mr. WADSWORTH. There is no such indication whatever.

Mr. ELMER. It has been known for over a year here that commerce is going on between the Japs and the Russians just the same as ever.

Mr. WADSWORTH. There is no such indication whatever in the testimony. We have inquired about those things to the limit. I do not suspect for one moment that the Russian Government is stealing our property and handing it to the Japanese.

Mr. ELMER. Are we not making exchanges of goods with Spain, and is not Spain delivering some of that gasoline and other material they get from us to Germany?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Spain and our relations with Spain have no relation whatever to lend-lease; none whatever.

Mr. ELMER. Generally, on trade and traffic, including lend-lease.

Mr. WADSWORTH. There is no lend-lease traffic with Spain.

Mr. ELMER. What does the Secretary of State mean, then, by cracking down on neutrals that are trading with our enemies?

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is an entirely different field of endeavor. That is part of our economic warfare effort to prevent neutrals like Spain from sending vital material to Germany. Lend-lease has nothing to do with that.

Mr. ELMER. It is all in the same category of trading.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am glad the Secretary of State, if he has done as the gentleman says, has clamped down on Spain.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BLOOM. I call the attention of the gentleman from Missouri to pages 231 and 232 of the hearings. If he will read those facts brought forth in the hearings, he will find all the answers.

Mr. WADSWORTH. As I said at the beginning of my somewhat rambling remarks, the concern your committee had with respect to what is known as the final settlement was confined to that thought that perhaps the President of the United States, whoever he may be, in making those settlements might commit the Government of the United States to a future military policy or a future economic policy. This amendment states in effect that no such commitment shall be made without recourse to our established constitutional procedure.

There are two of those procedures, with which I assume every Member is familiar. If the proposed commitment is temporary in character and does not involve a long-term course of action, it is generally reached in the form of what is known as an Executive agreement, which lasts, we will say, only 2 or 3 years, like

U. N. R. R. A., which is to last only 3 years, as I recollect. But that Executive agreement cannot become operative unless the Congress of the United States by action of both Houses legislates on the subject to the extent of authorizing the implementing of the program. So if it is merely an executive agreement committing the United States for a short period to some course of action, the Congress must pass upon it.

If the President of that day proposes the committal of the United States for a long-term performance binding the Government and the people of the United States to a course of action which can only be set down in a contract in treaty form, then, of course, a committal of that kind must come back to the Senate of the United States and be ratified, under the Constitution, by a two-thirds majority. That is the intention of the amendment proposed by the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. The gentleman says the title to all this lend-lease material we are sending to the various countries remains in the United States and will remain in the United States after the war is over. I am wondering if there has been any provision made to prevent the countries where this lend-lease material is located from charging us storage on it after the war.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I do not know of any specific provision of the Lend-Lease Act which forbids the beneficiary from charging storage. It would go beyond my comprehension how any one would dare try such a thing. We hold the upper hand in this. If the gentleman will just stop and think, he will realize that we hold the upper hand.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. If title remains in us, and if no provision is made against it, they can legally charge us storage on all that equipment after the war, and thereby consume all or a part of its value.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I will not assert that there is specific provision in the Lend-Lease Act which forbids a thing of that sort, but I honestly believe that the gentleman's fears are not well founded. This material will be outdoor material, nearly all of it.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. The new lease-lend that we have before us will provide that no lease-lend is to go to nonparticipating nations, nations who are not actively participating in the war on our side.

Mr. WADSWORTH. We do not propose any change in the existing Lend-Lease Act as to the eligibility of nations to receive any of this aid. They are the people who are fighting alongside of us.

Mr. KNUTSON. Then we can continue to build roads in South America, with lease-lend funds; can we?

Mr. WADSWORTH. We have not done that.

Mr. KNUTSON. Senator Butler says we have done it.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Not under lend-lease.

Mr. KNUTSON. It is done, whatever you call it; it is done with American funds that are squeezed out of the pockets of the American taxpayer. What are we going to do to stop that kind of spending?

Mr. WADSWORTH. You cannot stop it under the Lend-Lease Act because it is not in the act.

Mr. KNUTSON. Then you can write a provision there to stop it from being done under the other acts which Congress has enacted.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It would probably be subject to a point of order. I would like to say something about the South American situation. There has been a lot of misunderstanding about it. We hear, and doubtless a good deal of what we hear is true, that certain agencies of our Government have spent money or loaned money, or made grants of money in South America in extravagant fashion. Those loans or grants have not gone through lend-lease. All we have done through lend-lease in South America has been on the urgent advice of our military authorities. The total of contributions to all the South American countries put together under lend-lease is only \$127,000,000. That is all, and two-thirds of that has been used in Brazil. In Brazil it has been used to build airports near Natal, from which our own planes fly to Ascension Island and on to the West Coast of Africa, from there to Khartoum and to India. It has been used to help the Brazilians equip their own air corps. With their own air force they patrol the South Atlantic against the submarine menace in our behalf and they have already themselves, with planes furnished by us and flyers furnished by themselves, sunk German submarines. That is the nature of lend-lease contributions to the South American countries. There has been no financing of industrial undertakings in South America through lend-lease. If that has been done, it is coming through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or some other agency of the Government in sums far greater than lend-lease has expended. And lend-lease, as I say, has expended funds solely for military purposes.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman from New York stated that an amendment of that kind would be subject to a point of order. It would be clearly in order under the Holman rule, because it would be a limitation on expenditures.

Mr. WADSWORTH. This is not an appropriation bill.

Mr. KNUTSON. It is an authorization.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Perhaps so, I do not know. But it has nothing to do with the extension of lend-lease.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Am I correct in my understanding that some 46 nations have participated or benefited from lend-lease?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I think it is 40 nations.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. In line with the question of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] it would seem that if the expenditures under lend-lease were limited to those nations which are actively engaged or participating in the war, a great amount of the funds would be saved and it would seem the war has reached the point where we could limit the expenditure to those nations. In Brazil, I agree with the gentleman from New York, they should be assisted because they have participated actively and used their forces and navy for patrol purposes and have shown themselves disposed to help. But I cannot see the wisdom of extending the operations under lend-lease to other nations not in any way remotely connected with the war.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I believe there are two categories of nations. One category includes those who have declared war against Germany and Japan and the other category consists of those nations who have broken off diplomatic relations and helped to establish what we know as the blockade. I stand subject to correction by members of the committee on that statement. Those latter nations receive next to nothing, it is so very small.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. One thing I would object to, I am informed that American ships after hauling lend-lease materials and supplies to England are charged for berthing the ships from which the supplies are taken and we also pay for the sand which is used for ballast in returning the empty ship to this country.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The gentleman has heard something which is not substantiated by facts. Every American ship reaching Great Britain is berthed and serviced and repaired at the expense of Great Britain. That has been made perfectly clear in our testimony.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. I am glad to hear that.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is a part of lend-lease in reverse. Every ship of ours that goes over there which needs any repairs is repaired in a British dock or shipyard at their expense and serviced at their expense.

Mr. SCRIVENER. And then the amount is charged back.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is called lend-lease in reverse.

Mr. ROWE. The amount is charged back.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Lend-lease in reverse, I might say, Mr. Chairman, is growing very gratifyingly and we have received some very important help from other nations.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mrs. BOLTON. The gentleman will recall in the hearings when we had the

State Department before us, we were informed of certain agreements with South America which we were not at liberty to make public. There were agreements with South America which were different from the agreements made with other nations across the water. Does the gentleman from New York recall that?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I do recall the incident; yes.

Mrs. BOLTON. I bring that out in order to keep the record clear.

Mr. WADSWORTH. We were given to understand it is wiser not to make those agreements completely public because under them today we are securing from certain Central and South American countries a certain amount of very, very vital supplies and rare minerals. That is not done under lend-lease. It is done under other agencies of Government. That is part of the financing, I imagine, that has taken place in those countries, but not under lend-lease. Those agreements will not be exposed to German and Japanese view lest they know just what we are getting.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. The malaria-control project in Venezuela is not under lend-lease, but is handled through the Office of Inter-American Affairs?

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is correct.

Mr. Chairman, I am glad to be able to state that lend-lease in reverse, so-called, shows a very encouraging trend upward. Our troops in the South Pacific under General MacArthur get 90 percent of their food free of charge from Australia and New Zealand.

Mr. ROWE. When you say "free of charge," it accrues as a credit to the nation with whom we are doing business, and charged back against our account whereby we sent them supplies?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I think it is fair to say that Australia and New Zealand would never ask to be paid for that food any more than we would ask them to pay for ammunition which they are shooting out there because we sent it to them.

Mr. ROWE. In other words, it checks and balances one against the other more or less?

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is right. The biggest lend-lease is to Great Britain and Russia. Great Britain's lend-lease in reverse is growing very rapidly.

Mr. ROWE. I would like to hear the gentleman make a statement as to one other rumor early in the history of lend-lease which filtered through, that in Great Britain lend-lease materials were going to some 30 countries, subordinate and within the domain of Great Britain. Has the gentleman any facts on that?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The truth is that no such thing happened. Under the agreement with Great Britain, and I think the same agreement stands with all the others, Great Britain is forbidden to export any lend-lease article sent to her by us or any similar article of equal value. In other words, if we send her 4 bales of cotton and she gets 4 bales of cotton from

Egypt and could get along with 4 bales, under the agreement she cannot export any of them. So her export trade, so far as these particular items are concerned, is in a firm grip.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes.

Mr. BLOOM. On that point, that applies now and after the war is over also as far as exports are concerned and it applies to all items. They cannot export anything without our consent.

Mr. WADSWORTH. As long as the agreement lasts.

Mr. BLOOM. Yes.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. The gentleman who is now addressing the Committee heard the rather extensive hearings which we had upon this bill, and I am glad that some of the questions have been asked of him with reference to these false rumors. I simply want to ask the gentleman from New York is it not true in the hearings the committee had that various similar rumors with reference to the lend-lease came to the attention of the committee and the committee, after investigating them, found out there was no foundation whatever for these criticisms after these fears had been expressed?

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is true. May I remind the Members of the various statements of rumors with respect to goods sent by lend-lease to north Africa. They were all sent under the advice of our military authorities. Some of the articles may not have seemed to be of direct military use or value. But they were so regarded by our military authorities as useful and valuable in establishing a friendly attitude among the French and Arabs. But every penny of it has been paid back. The French Committee on Liberation has paid back in cash for all the stuff we have given them—\$62,000,000.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. One of the things I am pleased to know, information has been brought to me that where formerly we were shipping coal either under lend-lease or whatever agency may have been handling it, to the Mediterranean area, at the same time England was exporting coal to the Argentine. However, that has been stopped, and this Nation is now sending some 15,000 tons per month to the Argentine, and coal which was formerly transshipped is now going into the Mediterranean area. That shows the co-operation the gentleman has been referring to and I am happy to know that has been brought about.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. How about the large quantities of farm machinery that have been allocated for foreign export?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I do not have the figures before me, but the committee examined into that with great care.

Mr. KNUTSON. When we first took it up they disclaimed all knowledge of it. Then a certain member produced photostatic copies showing the invoices, and then they admitted it, quite reluctantly. I am wondering whether this Committee is taking this man's word for it, this man who will not give us the information.

Mr. WADSWORTH. First, let me say to the gentleman from Minnesota that that question occurred in connection with the deliberations of the House on the so-called U. N. R. R. A. bill. It is completely separate from lend-lease, but our Committee on Foreign Affairs did examine into the question of the exportation of farm machinery and we found that in the approximately 3 years of operation of lend-lease, the percentage of our total production of farm machinery which lend-lease has loaned to Australia and New Zealand, for example, to increase their crops, and to Great Britain to increase its crops, amounts to something like 3 percent of our total production. That is all.

Mr. KNUTSON. But our farmers cannot get equipment.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Neither can the British or Australian or New Zealand farmers get equipment.

Mr. KNUTSON. Why neglect our own people? This is the arsenal of democracy we are told. I presume it is the breadbasket too, if we look into it a little further.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Let me say to the gentleman from Minnesota there comes into the question which he propounds the consideration of policy. We have sent thousands and thousands of troops to Australia, who from there range their attack through Guadalcanal, up through the Solomon Islands toward Rabaul and New Guinea and all that vast area, for thousands of miles. Australia is something like 6,000 miles from the Pacific coast of the United States. Everything we send down there for the supply of those troops has to be sent in ships. If we sent sufficient food to feed all those troops it would take a great many more ships. The Australians and New Zealanders say to us, "Under this lend-lease agreement we will be glad to feed your men, but to do so we will have to increase our crops. If you can send us some farm machinery and some seeds, with the seeds we will increase our acreage, with the farm machinery we will increase our harvests, and we can feed all the men you send." A tiny, little dribble of farm machinery, compared with the whole production of the United States, was sent to Australia and New Zealand. Quite a great many cream separators were sent. That does not look like a military weapon, but New Zealand and Australia vastly increased their production of dairy products, and our men are eating them. They need more cream separators to do it.

Mr. KNUTSON. How many men have we in Australia?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I could not tell you.

Mr. KNUTSON. It is not as many as would warrant the shipments that have been made there.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I would advise the gentleman from Minnesota to take that up with the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. The gentleman commented upon the shipping of commercial articles to north Africa for sale to the natives, and that those articles were paid for in cash by the French committee. I wish to remind the gentleman that the natives in north Africa are not so much interested in cash as what they can buy with it. They are not much interested—the Arabs—in raising wheat or wheat products unless they get something that they want besides money. Therefore what is happening there is that various sorts of articles which the Arabs wanted were imported, not to give to them but so that the French could sell them to them, so that the Arabs, in order to have some money with which to buy those articles, would raise more wheat and sell it to the French or to the Allies in order to get the money to buy the articles that we imported. Therefore the importation of some articles which look exceedingly unwarlike resulted in increasing the production of what they call commercialized wheat in north Africa, commercialized wheat being wheat that you persuade the natives to get out of their granaries and into commercial channels.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes. And north Africa is a great wheat-producing region. Also a very heavy producer of fresh vegetables, and is now coming back into form again in the production of food. We have helped that a great deal and it has not cost us a cent. It has paid us back for everything we have sent there.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Will the gentleman yield for a further question?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. I am informed that we purchase wheat in Canada and grind it here and then send it to England under lend-lease. Is there any substantiation back of that statement?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am not sure that I know the answer completely, but I know we have no lend-lease agreement with Canada. Canada has her own arrangement with Great Britain under which she has agreed to furnish directly to Great Britain large amounts of food. We have no lend-lease agreement with Canada at all. The gentleman says wheat has been purchased in Canada and ground into flour in this country?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. And then sent to England under lend-lease.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I think it might be purchased by the Canadian Government and ground into flour on our side and then sent to England. But I do not know the facts.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. On the former question there was considerable confusion relative to the 2 or 3 percent. The machinery which was programed for U. N. R. R. A. was tried to be explained by a statement which emanated from up on Sixteenth Street, I am told, at a press conference, that we had only exported about 2 percent of the farm

machinery which we had manufactured. The statement was made as to how much we had exported, compared with what we were intending to export, and I am gratified to find out that statement, just released, is in connection with U. N. R. R. A. and it has been changed from 136,000 tons to 30,000 tons.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am not surprised at all at that information.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Perhaps the gentleman saw in the press within the past few weeks that Canada has passed a law which they have labeled "A mutual war aid bill," keeping away from what I consider a misnomer—lend-lease.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Terrible.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. And in their legislation they provide they will furnish articles under agreements with various nations for mutual war aid, and that unless specifically provided in the agreement, they do not expect to get the article back. They have a realistic bill on this subject.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] has again expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself sufficient time to answer a few questions.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, one question to which I wish particularly to refer is to whether Japan and Russia have been exchanging merchandise. I invite the Committee's attention to pages 230, 231, and 232 of the hearings where answers to most of the questions that have been asked here today will be found. I read from page 232 of the hearings:

Perhaps the most sensational rumor is the one that the Russians have taken some of the planes we sent them and have traded them to the Japanese in return for rubber. These planes were then allegedly used against our forces in the Pacific.

The fact with reference to this rumor, as printed in the hearings, is as follows:

Rumors of this type, frequently emanating from Radio Tokio, have been repeatedly investigated by representatives of the State Department and other agencies, and proved to be without foundation. There is not an atom of truth in this particular rumor.

Mr. Chairman, I wish also to call attention to the statement appearing at the bottom of page 7 of the report dealing with the question of the total value of lend-lease material exported to other American republics.

The total value of lend-lease materials exported to other Latin-American republics from March 11, 1941, to December 31, 1943, was \$127,000,000.

This has already been stated by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

Commercial exports from the United States to Latin America in the years 1941, 1942, and 1943 totaled \$2,300,000,000, 18 times the lend-lease total.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield.

Mr. ROWE. Do the hearings contain anything in regard to the question I propounded to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] as to whether or not England received lend-lease materials from this country which she channeled to one of her dominions and used in commercial trade?

Mr. BLOOM. I have never heard of that. I do not see how that could happen. There are many rumors; as a matter of fact, yesterday's New York Times, on page 1, carried an article on lend-lease rumors. All these lend-lease rumors that are known are answered in the hearings, starting on page 230. If the gentleman has any new ones, I shall be glad to try to answer them.

Mr. ROWE. Is there anything pertaining to that rumor in the hearings?

Mr. BLOOM. I do not recall anything like that.

Mr. ROWE. One other question: If England did not channel lend-lease materials received from the United States to one of her dominions, did she export to that dominion like materials of like value to be used in commercial trade?

Mr. BLOOM. No; she could not do that under lend-lease.

Mr. ROWE. The reason I ask these questions is because I recall seeing a letter signed by Mr. Stettinius, as head of Lend-Lease, stating that such a thing had occurred. I am going to see if that letter is available, and if it is, place it in the RECORD tomorrow.

Mr. BLOOM. If the gentleman finds it, I should like to have a copy of it. If the gentleman inserts it in the RECORD, I think an answer to it should be inserted in the RECORD at the same time by me.

Mr. ROWE. That is the reason I mentioned it; I want to know the truth or falsity of the rumor, and the facts.

Mr. BLOOM. I may say to the gentleman from Ohio that the Foreign Affairs Committee went over every phase of this subject. We tried to get the facts; we want the facts in order to present them to the Congress. If the gentleman will read the hearings and the report, he will find that we have taken up every question with reference to what lend-lease has been doing and what lend-lease has not been doing. We have answered all the questions, and the answers are to be found right in the hearings. We are just as anxious to get facts and give them to the membership as the Members are to receive them.

Mr. ROWE. I think my reactions, if I may continue, are no different than those of the gentleman from New York, that any person charged with responsibility for the welfare of this country would deliberately do things that would militate against its interests and when these things come to my attention it gives me a sense of alarm, as it would the gentleman, I am sure.

Mr. BLOOM. The gentleman is quite right; there is no doubt about that. If the gentleman will write out these questions or rumors, I shall be very glad to investigate them.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. It is rumored that England purchases all the beef that is exported by the Argentine. I am further informed that those purchases are with American lend-lease funds. Is that true? Or has the gentleman any information on it?

Mr. BLOOM. Oh, no, no; that is not correct.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Has the gentleman any information on it? I would like some information concerning it.

Mr. McMURRAY. We do not lend-lease any money.

Mr. BLOOM. If the gentleman will write out his questions tonight and send them to me, I shall be very glad to investigate and give the gentleman a definite answer as to what the facts are with reference to them. We want to get the facts. We do not want to hedge or hide or try to hide. Give me the questions, and I shall be very glad to get the facts and answer the questions.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. How much has lend-lease cost us to date?

Mr. BLOOM. About \$22,000,000,000. Something like \$24,000,000,000 was appropriated; \$22,000,000,000 has been expended and allocated.

Mr. KNUTSON. That is about one-third the total expenditures of the other United Nations since the war broke out. The war has cost us \$180,000,000,000, but it has cost the other belligerent countries only about \$68,000,000,000.

Mr. BLOOM. The gentleman must remember that although we have given Russia and some of the other countries a lot of material and a lot of aid and assistance, it has cost them a lot in blood and human lives, and they have done a great job. I think the gentleman will admit that.

Mr. KNUTSON. I am not questioning that.

Mr. BLOOM. Then I would not criticize. I would not want to measure life and blood against money, or money against life and blood.

Mr. KNUTSON. But how about the future solvency of America? Does that enter into it at all?

Mr. BLOOM. I will answer that in this way: Do not ever sell America short at any time.

Mr. KNUTSON. Four more years of the New Deal and you could not sell America at all.

Mr. BLOOM. In answer to that I still say do not ever sell America short at any time.

Mr. ELMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield.

Mr. ELMER. Does the gentleman recall that the State Department protested to Great Britain against the selling of lend-lease goods to her colonies?

Mr. BLOOM. Do I recall that?

Mr. ELMER. Or can the gentleman find out from the State Department whether that is a fact?

Mr. BLOOM. I want to have all the rumors answered. If the gentleman wants me to find out whether that rumor was true or false, I shall be very glad to.

Mr. ELMER. All we can learn is what we read in the newspapers.

Mr. BLOOM. Oh, no; no.

Mr. ELMER. That is what Will Rogers once said.

Mr. BLOOM. Oh, no. If the gentleman will read the hearings and the reports instead of depending only on the newspapers, he will find what the facts are.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Do I understand the gentleman correctly to say that the expense for lend-lease since 1941 is only what was expended directly under the lend-lease law? While the things sent under lend-lease may tend to aid their military activities, yet it does not include things like armaments and such matters as are handled by the Army and Navy.

Mr. BLOOM. Right, right.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. The \$22,000,000,000 covers more or less nonmilitary matters, such as food—

Mr. BLOOM. Oh, no.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. It does not include munitions and things of that kind.

Mr. BLOOM. Yes; the \$22,000,000,000 is directly under lend-lease. The other would be entirely different.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. So actually the expenditure under the Lend-Lease Act approximates sixty to sixty-five billions of dollars, including things furnished by the Army, Navy, lend-lease.

Mr. BLOOM. No; not that much.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. I wish to be correct about it.

Mr. BLOOM. Let me give it to you. I have been giving these amounts from memory. I will read them from the record now. Twenty-four billion dollars has been appropriated to the President, of which about \$22,000,000,000 has been allocated. Then there are thirty-five billions on transfer of authority to the War and Navy Departments. That is what the gentleman refers to.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Yes; that is what I am referring to.

Mr. BLOOM. There is no secret about it. It is public.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. I realize that, but I wanted the country to know that the 35 and the 22 would equal the total.

Mr. McMURRAY. All of the war implements that have been transferred are in the \$22,000,000,000.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. I realize that, and I am perfectly willing to tax my district and the rest of the country and the individuals therein, to give aid and assistance to those who are participating in the war.

Mr. BLOOM. So is every Member of the House.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. But I do not want it passed out to 30 other nations that are not engaged in the war. That is the only objection I have. We are passing it out to some 40 nations, with only 15 actively engaged in the war. The balance of them are receiving assistance.

Mr. BLOOM. They all need some assistance. They are all helping us. They are all allies of ours.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. It has reached the point where five or six fellows can get together over there, declare war on the Axis, and then walk into Washington with a satchel.

Mr. BLOOM. No. Of course, I do not agree with the gentleman.

Mr. ELMER. Did the gentleman have the Senators who made this world trip before his committee to testify, the Senators who made this world trip and who made the charges about lend-lease and England?

Mr. BLOOM. No. Would the gentleman? We did not have them before our committee to testify. What would you do? We obtained the facts from the proper sources.

Mr. ELMER. I asked the gentleman if he had those Senators before his committee.

Mr. BLOOM. No. We went right to the source to get the correct information and that is the information you are getting.

Mr. ELMER. Would not they be the source of the rumors that are sent out?

Mr. BLOOM. No. They brought too many rumors back themselves.

Mr. ELMER. I heard them make the speeches over in the Senate and they made charges. Why did you not have them before the committee?

Mr. BLOOM. Because we had the real authority and received the correct information.

Mr. ELMER. You did not want to find out the facts about it, is that it? You did not want to find out the truth about it?

Mr. BLOOM. I would not say that.

Mr. ELMER. Why did you not have those Senators before your committee?

Mr. BLOOM. We did not think it necessary. We have received the true facts from official governmental sources.

Mr. ROWE. Now, I think the gentleman from New York wants to handle this job in a nice manner. We cannot joke about \$24,000,000,000, and I think anyone who rises to ask a question of the chairman of the committee—he may be wrong as I was in some of these instances—should be answered courteously. We should not joke about the matter. We should accord men the courtesy that the situation demands.

Mr. BLOOM. Have I not done that?

Mr. ROWE. The gentleman asked what would the gentleman do, with reference to questioning a Senator. The chairman of the committee knows that is impossible and I think you should advise the gentleman of that fact.

Mr. BLOOM. We went to the source to get the real information. We did not go to people who go into a town for a couple of hours and come out with a lot of rumors. We went to the real source, to your representatives, to your agents; that is the only place we can go to get real information.

Mr. ROWE. The only thing I had reference to is this: It is a very serious matter and we should not treat it too lightly. At least, as far as I am concerned, I feel deeply about it.

Mr. BLOOM. The gentleman should read the reports of the hearings. We

had 10 days of hearings on this, and that is not treating it lightly.

Mr. ROWE. That statement has been made two or three times by the gentleman who is now yielding to me. The report came to the desk only a little while ago. It is impossible to read that report and the hearings in the time we had to consider this bill. By tomorrow that statement may be appropriate. Today it is not.

Mr. BLOOM. You have had the printed hearings since Saturday.

Mr. ROWE. No; I have not had it since then.

Mr. BLOOM. I am reminded of the fact that we will not read this bill for amendment until Wednesday. So the gentleman will have tomorrow and Wednesday to read the report and the hearings. I may say that the committee filed its report on March 30, so you have had from March 30 to April 17 to read this report. That is not putting it in overnight.

Mr. ROWE. I may be wrong in some of the things I have heard but, if I may suggest to the gentleman, he does not want us to be wrong with our vote.

Mr. BLOOM. Oh, no. I know your vote is going to be all right.

Mr. ROWE. Discourtesy is the easiest way to change it.

Mr. BLOOM. No one could ever accuse me of being discourteous.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I am glad that the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs has made the statement he did with reference to the vote on this bill. I am advised by the leadership that it has been agreed to read this bill for amendment on Wednesday and vote on that day, if possible; so that these interesting proceedings will go on today and we will then have more tomorrow, if there is more; then the reading of the bill and the vote will come on Wednesday.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I think the most significant aspect of the question which is before us today, tomorrow, and Wednesday is not whether or not we extend the lend-lease for another year, because I am convinced, as I think most of you are, that that is going to be done. It must be done. We have to finish the winning of this war.

The significant aspect is that we have an amendment which I want to talk about a little while today, brought into lend-lease for the first time since lend-lease first came down to us from a sort of Executive Mount Sinai a few years ago. Away back then in 1941 an effort was made by us minority members of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, both in committee and on the floor, to write in an amendment which would bring Congress into the picture a little more definitely than it was in the original language of the bill. That effort failed.

We have renewed the effort every time since when lend-lease has been before us, and every time since the effort has also failed. But the Democratic majority of our Foreign Affairs Committee are reasonable men and like granite

their resistance wears away with the constant dripping of water.

This time by unanimous vote we have agreed on language that brings Congress into the picture of lend-lease settlements for the first time. As a committee we have recognized that we went a bit too far in vacating all congressional authority over the outcome of lend-lease, its operations, and its settlement. So this amendment, a sort of Topsy affair which grew up in the committee, everybody contributing a little bit to its eventual development, was unanimously agreed to.

It was the original brain child of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. SCHIFFLER], who brought it in and advocated it very eloquently and persuasively for several days in different forms. After considerable discussion, the gentleman from New York added to the proposal, he revised the language, offered it and resubmitted it in modified forms, and again the amendment lay on the table. We discussed it. It was mulled over and modified somewhat, until finally this Schiffer-Wadsworth amendment has come before us in the language in which it now appears for your consideration.

I think this is a tremendously important piece of legislation because it marks the first time since this bill came before us in the original instance that the Congress has written its intentions into lend-lease, that the Congress has asserted itself, that Congress has said there is something in this which we should do, there is a place where we should also be consulted. This amendment defines the lend-lease responsibilities of Congress and limits the lend-lease authorities of the President.

Mr. WRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WRIGHT. I do not wish to interrupt the gentleman's train of thought.

Mr. MUNDT. That is quite all right.

Mr. WRIGHT. I take it the thought behind the amendment was that lend-lease is a war or military weapon and the committee wanted to be sure that lend-lease should not be carried over into post-war planning and post-war relations between the various countries. To safeguard the lend-lease program against that, the amendment was suggested and unanimously adopted.

Mr. MUNDT. I think the gentleman is exactly correct. There is nothing in the intent of the amendment and nothing in its operations which could in any way change the Lend-Lease Act as a war measure. It deals with post-war activities and implications of lend-lease and the final lend-lease settlements. That is correct.

Mr. Chairman, I want to read this amendment because I have a suggestion which I think perhaps should be included in the amendment, which I brought up in committee, but in this Topsy-like growth in connection with the evolution of the amendment my suggestion failed to be included in the final version.

I think it failed to attach itself in part because I did not have it expressed in very good language at the time, but since

then I have been in consultation during the recess with the legislative counsel, and we have worked out what I believe is appropriate language. So if the idea appeals to the Members of the House, I hope it accepts this amendment, because it seems to me it rounds out the thing which we are endeavoring to do by the amendment developed by Mr. SCHIFFLER and Mr. WADSWORTH.

Let me, first of all, read the amendment as it appears before us and then suggest my very minor modification in language, but I think important modification in significance. This is the amendment, and I will read the portion of the act which it amends, which is now section No. 2, so that section 3 (b) of the original act would read as follows:

The terms and conditions upon which any such foreign government receives any aid authorized under subsection (a) shall be those which the President deems satisfactory, and the benefit to the United States may be payment or repayment in kind or property, or any other direct or indirect benefit which the President deems satisfactory.

This is the language of the amendment as adopted by our committee:

Provided, however, That nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to authorize the President in any final settlement to assume or incur any obligations on the part of the United States with respect to post-war economic or post-war military policy except in accordance with established constitutional procedure.

During the discussion of that amendment in committee I suggested that it seemed to me that we had rather conspicuously left out a third aspect which ordinarily appears in discussion on legislation dealing with governmental operations.

We ordinarily talk about economic, military, and political consequences; economic, military, and political operations; economic, political, and military activities—so I suggested that perhaps we should put in this amendment also the words "post-war political policies"—so that other nations would have crystal clear before them that under our concept of government they, too, have to come back to Congress through an established constitutional procedure. The not altogether united, but rather well collectivized and highly persuasive, counsel of my colleagues convinced me however that that was not very satisfactory language and we sort of agreed to drop it for the time being and I would continue my study along that line.

As I say, with the aid of the legislative counsel, I now bring before you this proposed language which I think should be inserted in the amendment as we have adopted it in order to round out the picture and present to the country and to our allies exactly the position which Congress understands to be evolved in this connection. I would add to the amendment where it now reads "that nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to authorize the President in any final settlement to assume or incur any obligations on the part of the United States with respect to post-war economic or post-war military policy" these words "or

any post-war policy involving international relations," which I am told conforms with the legislative standards and the legislative language and the legislative policies of prior legislation. This would round out the table and would give us, if you please, the third leg of a three-legged support upon which we are building our foreign policy and our post-war lend-lease operations.

I think it is fully as important that we do reserve to Congress the constitutional procedures by amendment in this bill which involve post-war international relations and policies pertaining thereto as it is important that we make these reservations for activities in the field of economics and activities in the field of military operations.

I am hopeful that the members of the committee, after hearing this discussion and the presently proposed language, will agree with me and that we can during the course of this discussion agree on a committee amendment which will incorporate this third aspect in language which is appropriate and in language which reserves to Congress specifically its constitutional prerogatives in the field of foreign policies and international relations just as we are doing it in the fields of economics and military affairs.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I am in thorough accord with the principle the gentleman is seeking to state, but what I am not clear on is this: How can we draw the line between temporary or military executive agreements that probably must be concluded by the President and the broader international political agreements where we are determined that the people's representatives shall pass on them before they shall go into force?

I have in my mind a very clear determination that our foreign policy—military, political, and economic—shall be evolved by the President and Congress together, and not by the President, but I am somewhat at a loss as just how to state that difference, and I wonder if the gentleman feels that his amendment will make that difference clear?

Mr. MUNDT. It will make it as clear in the field of international relations as it is clear in the field of economics and military operations, because in all three instances it applies only, as was pointed out by the gentleman from Pennsylvania a few minutes ago, to post-war activities and post-war operations and post-war agreements which will continue and project themselves beyond the end of the war.

There will be many intermediate emergency agreements in the field of economics and in the field of military operations and in the field of politics—assuredly in the field of politics—which are temporary things, to meet an emergency situation, a temporary expedient,

but this amendment deals with the long-term continuing things.

We have Members in Congress and members in the executive branch who feel that lend-lease should be used as sort of a wedge with which to determine the sovereignty of certain countries and the sovereignty of certain islands and the willingness of certain nations to cooperate in commercial transactions, as well as in permanent international organizations. We have other members of the executive branch and in Congress who feel that lend-lease should not be used in such a manner at all in the post-war field.

Whether it is or whether it is not, it seems to me it certainly is something that should be handled in accordance with established constitutional procedure just as should decisions on post-war military and economic policies.

It might be argued by some, if you were inclined to oppose this, that it is unnecessary. Perhaps it is, but it is never unnecessary in my opinion to spell out in the legislation itself the right which Congress has. It may add nothing significant by its presence but it does obviate this danger that by omitting this important part of the triumvirate of language we eloquently imply something by our silence if we do not put it in. If we include it, then we have made ourselves clear.

I bring to you that hoary old question of Abraham Lincoln when he once asked a former constituent which leg of a three-legged stool is the most important. I do not know, and I do not know which leg of this three-legged amendment is the most important, the military one, the economic one, or the one dealing with international relations. However, if any are important, all are important, and for that reason I urge you Members of the House to work along with me on this and see if we cannot unanimously agree to incorporate this language in the Schiffer-Wadsworth amendment when it comes up on Wednesday.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has again expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that in renewing lend-lease for another year we ought to exercise a little of that Yankee shrewdness and caniness derived from our Scottish ancestry that is supposed to pervade our private dealings and carry those virtues over into the field of international relations.

There are certain things that we know were charged to us by certain of the Allied Nations in the First World War that rankle still in the minds of the American people who know about them. I refer particularly to the pretty well-authenticated statement that France charged us rental for the trenches we dug in her soil, that she charged us for every fruit tree or forest tree we destroyed in prosecuting that war to save France.

There is a pretty well-defined belief that the American people through

lend-lease are being taken for a similar ride. I suggest in perfect friendliness to all of the Allied Nations that here on the floor this afternoon has been revealed one case of that. I refer to the so-called reverse lend-lease. When the gentleman from New York was asked the question about reverse lend-lease, he stated that we are not being charged for dockage and wharfage, or whatever the charges are for unloading ships, but that England pays for those. However, as I understood him—and I shall be glad to be corrected if I am wrong—England then proceeds to charge those charges that she has paid in the first instance back against us. Is that correct?

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is part of the story. We also charge England with what we give to her. It is merely to keep some account of what we give and what we get.

Mr. LEWIS. Does the gentleman mean that we charge England with the lend-lease goods that are given her, that we keep a set of books?

Mr. WADSWORTH. We keep a set of books upon the goods we give or lend. Great Britain keeps a set of books as best she can of what she gives and lends to us, for our information, as we do it for their information. It is not a charge that we shall ever have to pay. It is merely for our information.

Mr. LEWIS. We are not getting any money back from England at the end of this war for the lend-lease goods we have given her, are we?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I assume we will not get any money back for the goods that have been utterly consumed, like food or ammunition. I think it would be absurd for us to try to collect from them for the food they have eaten and the ammunition they have fired off. But if some of the goods, some of the trucks, some of the jeeps, some of the airplanes are of any use to us, they are ours and we can take them back.

Mr. LEWIS. What happens to this charge for dockage and wharfage and those unloading charges at the port of entry in England?

Mr. WADSWORTH. We shall never have to pay it.

Mr. LEWIS. It is charged against us, though, is it not?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Merely as an item of information.

Mr. LEWIS. I am not very clear on that. It is a charge and it is not a charge.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It is not a charge.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEWIS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WRIGHT. I think, unless I am mistaken, that we have not precluded ourselves from charging England for that balance which remains after we deduct what she has furnished us, but, as a practical matter, we probably never will collect it. The supplies we have given to England, the services we have given to England in repairing her ships, are considerably greater than Britain's. So as a practical matter, any of these charges about which the gentle-

man speaks will never be collectible, because if you want to put it on a debtor and creditor basis, England will wind up owing us a credit on the lend-lease.

Mr. LEWIS. Very well. However that may be, I did not want to deal very much with that end of the problem, although it seems to me that we ought to make sure that we are not placed in the ridiculous position of having to recompense these Allies of ours for such charges for instance as the French made against us, after the last war, when they charged us for the use of their trenches or the trenches that we dug in their soil to save their country. That was done and that is pretty well established. It seems to me that such charges against us are utterly indefensible, and that those who are charged with the responsibility for administering lend-lease are derelict in their duty if they do not see to it that before these goods are furnished there shall be no possibility of any such ridiculous countercharges being made against us.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LEWIS. At the conclusion of this war, I do not know what the United States is going to expect at the peace conference, but I suspect that because of the rapidly developing aviation industry and, in the post-war world, the necessity for round-the-world air lines, one of the things we will want and need very, very urgently indeed, will be aviation bases around this world, over which our airplanes can fly to deliver the produce and the commerce of America. I suggest that before this legislation renewing lend-lease finally becomes law, the responsible officials of this Government dealing with these matters make clear to the nations that are receiving lend-lease from the United States that we shall expect at the conclusion of this war such and such aviation and other bases the world around, and shall get unequivocal promises from them that America shall in the post-war settlement receive those bases.

That is only one of the things we will need and that we shall have a legitimate right to demand, but I submit to you that as shrewd Yankee traders now is the time to begin to trade and not after these goods—these billions—have been expended, and then come hat in hand to the peace-conference table and present our requests there. If we wait until the peace conference maybe we will get them and maybe we will not. Let us get them now while the getting is good.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEWIS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. CLEVENGER. I note that about \$6,600,000,000 of goods were sent to Great Britain, according to this report, of which about 32 percent were agricultural products. I think I am betraying no Executive secret when I say that before my committee the inquiry was made as to that part of it which the British public consumed. We asked if that was

sold to the British people and were told "Yes." We asked if the money received for it was returned to lend-lease in the form of a revolving fund, and they said "No." Here is a sum somewhat in excess of \$2,000,000,000 that must have been used for exchange to buy food in various parts of the world.

In fact, that question was asked, and it was said that they had to buy a lot in the Argentine. So I think that there is an inquiry about the \$2,000,000,000, along the line of which the gentleman is speaking. It is sold to the British people, the money is received, and it is not returned to lease-lend in the form of a revolving fund.

Mr. LEWIS. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEWIS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. On the very question the gentleman has mentioned, on page 4 of the report that incident is cited. It shows 32 percent of \$6,595,000,000 as agricultural products sold. The gentleman spoke of shrewd trading. This would mean that \$2,000,000,000 in foodstuffs is delivered to England. The English people are receiving the benefit of \$2,000,000,000 in food. That is sold to the British, and they receive in turn \$2,000,000,000, with which in turn they purchase other supplies in the Argentine, about which I raised a question a moment ago. So \$4,000,000,000 in food products is going in there. If we get it back, it will strike a balance. If we do not get it back, the \$2,000,000,000 we are paying to them is going into the coffers of their treasury, purchasing food in other places, and twice the amount of the original allocation is being brought to the benefit of the English. It is a very shrewd business proposition. I admire them for being able to handle it.

Mr. LEWIS. I might say to the gentleman, I admire these allies of ours. I admire every one of them. I hope that the Congress of the United States can admire the executive department of this Government just as much after the conclusion of this further extension of 1 year of lend-lease.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MAGNUSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill H. R. 4254, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include therein an editorial from the Philadelphia Bulletin.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New

York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

PRESIDENT'S WAR RELIEF CONTROL BOARD

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call to the attention of the House a matter which I believe is vital to our unity and to our people. This matter deals with relief to war areas by the United States. In my district I have many thousands of Italians, outstanding Americans, who complain to me that they have not been given an opportunity to make contributions to assist the people in Italy, some of whom are their relatives, and that proper agencies have not been set up in accordance with their requests and their demands. I know that in every congressional district Americans of Italian descent have made similar protests because they feel that proper and better treatment could be given to the Italians in the occupied areas if there were greater funds at our disposal for that purpose. To get to the point I want to call the attention of the House to the President's War Relief Control Board established by Executive Order 9205, transferring to the Board administrative authority regarding solicitations and collections of funds and contributions for relief purposes.

The Board controls the solicitations, collections, and distributions of funds for charities for foreign and domestic relief and also provides registration or licensing or renewal or cancellation of such registrations and licenses permitting solicitations and collections for the purpose of feeding and caring for persons who need that care in the occupied areas of Europe. Under the regulations of this Board a group of Italian-Americans of outstanding ability led by one Generoso Pope, Judge Freschi, and others sought to establish a national organization for the purpose of collecting money from people who were willing to contribute toward this fund in order that the Italians in occupied Italy, in order that the women and children may get better care and treatment and get milk, clothing, and other necessities of life. Although the President's war fund has made contributions for that purpose, in my judgment it has not been sufficient. Better treatment and greater friendship could be brought about even amongst the Italian people in occupied Italy, that portion of Italy which is in the control of the Nazis, who feel that the people of Italy are not getting what they were promised by the Allied Nations if they surrendered. So, Mr. Speaker, these Americans of Italian descent have organized a group of outstanding American citizens who are ready to give their time and energy to help the Italian people. But the President's War Relief Control Board in Washington, which is controlled by Joseph E. Davies, Chairman, Charles P. Taft, Charles Warren, Melvin D. Hildreth, general counsel, and James Bruno, executive director, have failed to cooperate with a group of Americans and with their committee known as the American Committee for Italian Relief, Inc., with national headquarters at the Hotel Biltmore, in New York City, and

have deprived this group of the privilege to help and refused to give them a license to operate and collect money, which would positively relieve the American taxpayers from digging into their own pockets. For 1 whole year the matter has been pending before this President's War Relief Control Board without any action having been taken.

Suddenly a few days ago we heard that a committee had been formed, not of the people who had originally suggested the formation of such a committee. They named Arturo Toscanini, who in my judgment is a fine gentleman, but who is too old to carry on a strenuous fund-raising campaign. He could not go out campaigning. They named Don Ameche. They also named Dr. Angelo Patri and Gen. John Hildrin; and Mr. Justice Marchisio. It seems to me that the matter should be looked into, if necessary by Congress, in order that we may be in a position to tell this Board that if any citizens, whether they be of Italian, Polish, or Czech descent, are seeking to raise additional funds for the relief of occupied areas—which activity is essential to the war effort—they should be given some cooperation instead of abuse.

As I mentioned before, some time in the fall of 1943, a committee was organized in the city of New York on a national basis for the special purpose of bringing relief to the people in occupied Italian territory.

This committee consisted of Judge Pecora, of the New York Supreme Court; Luigi Antonini, president of the Italian-American Labor Council; Dr. Fama, the chairman of the medical board of the New York City pension system; Judge Allesandrini, of the Philadelphia common pleas court; Judge Freschi, of the New York City general sessions court; and other very prominent men in civic and fraternal life in the United States.

In order to conduct its activities, it was necessary to obtain an appropriate clearance from the War Relief Control Board in the State Department. The person contacted was Mr. Charles Taft. It was my privilege to speak to Mr. Taft personally about the set-up.

In addition to the persons mentioned, Mr. Generoso Pope, a prominent publisher in the city of New York, was to be treasurer of the organization. Mr. Pope has an exceedingly fine record with reference to his ability to raise relief funds, and since the plan of this committee was to raise some \$20,000,000 for that purpose, it was the consensus of opinion that Mr. Pope would be the logical person to act as treasurer of the committee. In various War Loan drives Mr. Pope had raised millions of dollars and his benefactions and charities likewise run into large sums of money.

When the matter was discussed with Mr. Taft, the only question raised was that the committee which was to be created was not representative enough, and Mr. Taft gave me a list of names of people who should be included in that committee. These names surely would have been included as it was not the desire of that committee to keep out anybody who could be helpful. The committee had one purpose, and one purpose alone,

which was to be able to offer effective relief to people in the Italian territory occupied by our forces. I have no doubt that if these men were permitted to serve, we would receive a substantial cooperation not only from the people of Italy who are now under our military occupation, but other Italians in the Axis-controlled portion of Italy as well. After all, the object of this committee was not only to raise funds so as to relieve our Government from the burden of supporting these unfortunate victims of Nazi aggression, but also to create good will for the American effort in that part of Italy which is now occupied by the Nazis.

Men of the type I have described are of exceedingly great importance to our war effort and it is our duty to utilize the influence these men have with the people of Italy for whatever good this influence can do for our war effort. I therefore thought it would be worth while to give Mr. Taft a detailed outline as to the background of the various men who were proposed for this committee for Italian relief.

First. The ability of the persons named to raise funds and, second, the prestige and importance of those persons both among the people of Italian extraction in the United States and many Italians in Italy.

As I stated before, one of the most important members of this committee would be Mr. Pope. Mr. Pope has always been a successful financial sponsor of any drive where funds had to be raised, and our Government saw fit to avail itself of his help to a large extent during the Third War Loan drive, in which Mr. Pope sold close to \$50,000,000 worth of bonds to approximately 650,000 persons. Likewise, during the Fourth War Bond drive, just concluded, Mr. Pope sold \$40,671,140 worth of bonds to some 555,000 persons.

After a long delay in obtaining some action on the part of the President's War Relief Control Board, I finally addressed a letter to Mr. Taft asking him to advise me what the situation was. Mr. Taft then wrote to me as follows:

APRIL 8, 1944.

DEAR MR. DICKSTEIN: I have your letter of April 3. I note that you expected to hear from me. I am sorry that there was some misunderstanding because I thought that you were going to attempt to get the Italian groups to come together voluntarily.

I enclose a copy of the announcement of our action. Mr. Jonathan Daniels at the moment is attempting to work out a solution of the arguments among the Italian groups, with the resulting addition of various persons to this temporary board of trustees.

I note your reference to money raising. I tried to emphasize to you at the time that you called on me that our board will not permit any national drives other than the National War Fund and the United Jewish Appeal. The Red Cross comes in March and the bond drives, three or four a year, so that our instructions from the President to reduce the burden of such appeals make it absolutely impossible for us to permit the Italian appeal. Furthermore, there is no necessity for it, because the National War Fund is prepared to allot from its contingent fund whatever may be necessary.

A further consideration is that the raising of any large amount of money to be spent in Italy is not only not a help, but it is a posi-

tive danger. The inflation situation is extremely serious, and the people in need can only be assisted by additional shipments and by competent personnel. Plans are well under way for providing for this.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES P. TAFT,
Acting Chairman.

This letter, to say the least, is amusing. In the first place, no mention is made of the previous stand taken by Mr. Taft, when he wanted to include other names in the proposed set-up. Now it is no longer a question of additional names, but the responsibility of according relief to the people in American-occupied territory in Italy. I do not know how much money there is in the national war fund for this purpose, but I doubt very much that a fund of this type could have reached such tremendous proportions that no other collections for relief purposes should be necessary. I have some unofficial information to the effect that the national war fund has people on its pay roll, who draw tremendously high salaries. The committee which was going to be organized by Judge Pecora and others would be serving without compensation, and every cent collected by them would be to the people concerned, without any deductions for expenses or any other purpose. The best figures I have at the present time on the financial situation of the Italian-American division are about \$150,000 from the national war fund. Of this \$150,000, a full third, namely \$50,000, was contributed by one labor union. I cannot believe that this would be an adequate sum to take care of all the cases which call for relief in Italian territory, occupied by our forces.

Reports reaching this country from Italy tell of the horrible conditions that exist in the liberated area of that country. Among many cases cited, the following is a typical one of a family consisting of a father, mother, and eight children, the youngest 2 months old. This family is living on a cellar floor, 3 inches under water and containing the usual dirt and filth which is brought on by the conditions caused by war. This family is crowded into three small rooms. The father is unemployed. The youngest baby is terribly undernourished due to lack of milk which is impossible to obtain. It is pathos like this that requires immediate relief to alleviate the suffering of the people in Italy.

There is no question that the creation of this committee would have been a tremendous help to the morale of Americans of Italian descent and would bring about close understanding and good will on the part of the Italians. It would be just one of those things which would cement our friendship with our erstwhile enemies and make loyal and devoted followers of the United Nations of many Italians who are otherwise lukewarm to our cause. We let this opportunity slip by, largely because of Mr. Taft's lack of cooperation, and we lost valuable help and again missed the bus in our dealings with Italy.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

MR. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman

from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] may extend his own remarks in the RECORD by inserting an editorial appearing in the Washington Evening Star.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania, for 2 days, on account of illness.

To Mr. SASSER, from April 17 through Friday, April 21, on account of official business, attending as a member of the Board of Visitors of the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2618. An act to regulate the placing of children in family homes, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2648. An act for the relief of Avid Evers;

H. R. 4133. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 18, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

The Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation will meet in executive session on Tuesday, April 18, 1944, at 10:30 a. m., for the consideration of S. 1767.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1433. A letter from the Director, Office of Defense Transportation, transmitting quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the quarter ending June 30, 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1434. A letter from the Chairman, National Mediation Board, transmitting quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the National Mediation Board, including the National Railroad Adjustment Board and the Railway Labor Panel, for the period ending June 30, 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1435. A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting its quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the fourth quarter of the fiscal year, beginning April 1, 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1436. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 500. Resolution providing for the payment of 6 months' salary compensation and \$250 funeral expenses to Mrs. Mary Glusing Elliott, widow of William P. Elliott, late an employee of the House; without amendment (Rept. No. 1353). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 4608. A bill to create an independent Civil Aeronautics Authority and an independent Air Safety Board, to promote the development and safety and to provide for the regulation of civil aeronautics, and to assure to the United States world leadership in aviation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NORMAN:

H. R. 4609. A bill for the relief of the Department of Labor and Industries of the State of Washington; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4610. A bill for the relief of the Department of Labor and Industries of the State of Washington; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'CONNOR:

H. R. 4611. A bill to provide for the payment of attorneys' fees from Osage tribal funds; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 4612. A bill to amend the act of October 17, 1942, authorizing the Secretary of War to approve a standard design for a service flag and a service lapel button, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 4613. A bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act, 1940, as amended; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. THOMASON:

H. R. 4614. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to convey to the State of Texas a certain tract of land situated in Travis County, Tex.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BULWINKLE:

H. R. 4615. A bill to establish, for the investigation and control of tuberculosis, a division in the Public Health Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GERLACH:

H. R. 4616. A bill to prohibit certain subsidy, indemnity, and other payments with respect to short-staple cotton and commodities manufactured from such cotton; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FULMER:

H. R. 4617. A bill to empower the Secretary of Agriculture to requisition certain material, equipment, and supplies not needed for the prosecution of the war and for the national defense and to use such material, equipment, and supplies in soil and water conservation, drainage, irrigation, grazing and other districts, and to distribute such materials, equipment, and supplies by grant or loan to public bodies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HARLESS of Arizona:

H. R. 4618. A bill to repeal the provisions of the War Labor Disputes Act relating to

political contributions by labor organizations; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. Con. Res. 79. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee to Investigate Federal Government Competition With Private Business; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. Res. 501. Resolution to provide for an investigation of the small-loan business; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. Res. 502. Resolution requesting information from the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. Res. 503. Resolution requesting the designation of Sunday, May 21, 1944, as a Day of Prayer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Michigan, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to provide for the prompt settlement of war contracts on termination thereof and for the removal and disposition of Government-owned facilities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Municipal Assembly of Guaynabo, P. R., memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to endorse Congressman McGEHEE's resolution demanding from President Roosevelt the immediate removal of Rexford Guy Tugwell as Governor of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Municipal Assembly of Fajardo, P. R., memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to endorse Congressman McGEHEE's resolution demanding the removal of Rexford G. Tugwell as Governor of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Municipal Assembly of Juana Diaz, P. R., memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to endorse Congressman McGEHEE's resolution requesting the immediate removal of Rexford Guy Tugwell from the governorship of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H. R. 4619. A bill for the relief of George Lassila; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JEFFREY:

H. R. 4620. A bill for the relief of Joseph F. Gdaniec; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 4621. A bill for the relief of Claude R. Whitlock, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire:

H. R. 4622. A bill for the relief of Patrick J. McLaughlin; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5493. By Mr. ANDREWS of New York: Resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of New York, favoring the observance of a Bill of Rights Day throughout the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5494. Also, letter received from the Railroad Workers' Protective League of Western New York, favoring the enactment of the Boren land-grant bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

5495. Also, resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of New York, voicing their views in connection with House bill 3420; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5496. Also, resolution adopted by the Common Motor Carriers of Western New York, Inc., protesting against the enactment of Senate bill 1161; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5497. By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL: Petition of the Hall Furlough Club, No. 1, North Side, Endicott, N. Y., and signed by 98 residents of the Thirty-fourth Congressional District, urging passage of the Hall furlough bill (H. R. 1504) providing free transportation during furloughs for members of our armed forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

5498. By Mr. JEFFREY: Petition of Herbert E. Cook and 87 other citizens of Dayton, Ohio, protesting against the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2032); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5499. By Mr. ANTON J. JOHNSON: Petition of Nellie Peterson and 50 other citizens of Moline, Ill., regarding prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war in order to reduce absenteeism and conserve manpower; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5500. By Mr. MARCANTONIO: Petition of more than 4,000 registered voters of the Borough of Manhattan in the city of New York, protesting against enactment of any prohibition laws as encouraging bootlegging and harming the war effort; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5501. By Mr. MERROW: Resolution adopted by executive committee of the New Hampshire Bankers Association, Manchester, N. H., opposing the passage of Senate bill 1642 and House bill 3956 and supporting the position taken by the Federal Reserve Board in connection with the issues raised; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5502. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of Pacific Coast Transportation Advisory Board of San Francisco regarding induction of essential railroad personnel into the armed forces, adopted March 16, 1944; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE

TUESDAY, APRIL 18, 1944

(Legislative day of Wednesday, April 12, 1944)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God who art behind the enshrouding mists and in them, we turn to Thee in whom there is no darkness at all. Through the mystery of earth's shadows lead our pilgrim feet as day by day we follow the gleam of Thy unfolding will for our lives, knowing that we cannot drift beyond the circle of Thy love and care. In patience and fidelity may we guard the flickering flame of the light within. Grant by Thy grace that in our particular sphere of service we may not be found wanting in this solemn hour of world crisis, when the bugles are sounding and the battle is set.

We pray, as increasing trials come upon us, we may not shirk the issues of these creative days, nor lose our victorious faith in the final overthrow of evil and the enthronement of righteousness and truth, but, solemnly committing ourselves and our country unto Thee, who knoweth the way we take, that we shall come forth like gold tried in the fire. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, April 17, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 866) to fix the compensation of registers of the district land offices in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 86. An act to grant pensions to certain unmarried dependent widows of Civil War veterans who were married to the veteran subsequent to June 26, 1905;

H. R. 1565. An act relating to the appointment of postmasters;

H. R. 1675. An act to amend section 9 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 (Public Law 607) by providing for the computation of double-time credits awarded between 1898 and 1912 in determining retired pay;

H. R. 2752. An act to authorize the acquisition of additional lands and flowage easements for the Pleasant Hill Reservoir, Ohio, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3054. An act to amend the Expediting Act;

H. R. 3524. An act to provide for the establishment of the Harpers Ferry National Monument;

H. R. 3732. An act to repeal the prohibition against the filling of a vacancy in the office of district judge in the district of New Jersey;

H. R. 4115. An act to give honorably discharged veterans, their widows, and the wives of disabled veterans, who themselves are not qualified, preference in employment where Federal funds are disbursed;

H. R. 4163. An act to amend section 2 of Public Law 17, Seventy-eighth Congress, relating to functions of the War Shipping Administration, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4238. An act providing for the naturalization of certain alien veterans of the Spanish-American War, the First World War, and members of the Regular Army or National Guard who served on the Mexican border from June 1916 to April 1917;

H. R. 4292. An act to amend section 12 (b) of the Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; and

H. R. 4320. An act relating to the computation of interest on contributions to the civil service retirement fund returned to employees upon their separation from the service.

INVITATION FROM SENATE OF NORTHERN IRELAND TO MAKE VISIT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Ambassador of Great Britain to the United States; together with a letter of invitation from

the Speaker of the Senate of Northern Ireland, which were read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

BRITISH EMBASSY,

Washington, D. C., April 14, 1944.

MY DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: I have been asked by the Foreign Office to transmit to you the enclosed letter.

Believe me, dear Mr. Vice President,

Yours very sincerely,

HALIFAX.

The Honourable the VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
Senate Office.

THE RIGHT HONORABLE THE

VISCOUNT BANGOR, O. B. E.,

Stormont, Belfast, March 21, 1944.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am directed by the Senators of Northern Ireland to extend to the delegation from the Senate of the United States, which, it is understood, may visit Great Britain in the near future, a very cordial invitation to spend some days with them as their guests in Northern Ireland.

Senators are very anxious to cement the excellent relations which have existed between the forces of the United States and the people of this country during the war, and to promote a closer association between this Parliament and Congress.

Very sincerely yours,

BANGOR.

Speaker of the Senate of Northern Ireland.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,

Washington, D. C.

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS UNDER NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Chairman of the National Mediation Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, estimates of personnel requirements for the National Mediation Board, including the National Railroad Adjustment Board and the Railway Labor Panel, for the quarter ending June 30, 1944, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Civil Service.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably the nominations of several postmasters.

DISPOSITION OF FEDERAL WAR HOUSING—INDEFINITE POSTPONEMENT OF A BILL

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, on December 18, 1943, I introduced S. 1607, a bill "to provide for the disposition of Federal War Housing." At the time of the introduction of the bill I had discussed this measure with a member of the National Committee on Housing, and was under the impression that the bill had the support of that committee. I have since learned that, while the bill reflects in substance proposals which that organization has made and published, proposals which have had wide approval, the committee seems to believe that most of its recommendations can be accomplished under existing laws.

I also received, on January 13, 1944, a letter from the Administrator of the National Housing Agency, a paragraph of which reads:

In summary, we feel that, through the process of experience over the past few years, and through the splendid cooperation of the